

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Roswell L. Gilpatrick, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Harold C. Stuart, resigned.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joe Barnes Harrison, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia, vice Henry O. Camp, deceased.

By Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Arthur W. Crocker, of Maryland, to the position of examiner in chief on the Board of Appeals of the United States Patent Office.

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert W. Knox, to be Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with rank of rear admiral; and

Maurice A. Hecht, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

POSTMASTER—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

Mr. MCFARLAND. I ask that the nomination of Arthur L. Jennings to be postmaster at Texarkana, Arkansas-Texas, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS—NEW REPORTS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I ask that the remaining nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 24, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

George W. Folta, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska. He is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired April 30, 1951.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Donald S. Burns, Corps of Engineers, to serve as president and member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California

Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. John S. Seybold, to be relieved.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Egbert Frank Bullene, O9708, United States Army, for appointment as Chief Chemical Officer, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Merwyn H. Squires, Chestnut Hill.

NEW YORK

Lee S. Murphy, Unadilla.

Thomas A. Brown, Wyandanch.

NORTH DAKOTA

Vivian M. Hilden, Reeder.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph K. Brown, Blue Ridge Summit.

Charles J. F. Ellis, Connellsville.

Stewart S. Young, Duncannon.

Keat P. Heefner, Mercersburg.

James L. O'Toole, Sharon.

Charles L. Johnston, Waynesboro.

TEXAS

Joyce W. Kemp, Fort Davis.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Grace C. Beasley, Pelahatchie, Miss.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the bountiful benefactor, ministering to the needs of our beloved country in every generation, make us more truly grateful for our glorious heritage of freedom and democracy.

Grant that we may be eager to prove worthy of these blessings which today are demanding so much of struggle and sacrifice on the part of many of our fellow citizens.

We pray that the Members of our Congress may know how to legislate wisely as they seek to find ways and means of defending and developing this heritage for the welfare and happiness of all mankind.

We give Thee all the praise and the glory through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3939. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives;

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; and

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2782) entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, May 24, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

Albert	Dondero	Hoffman, Ill.
Angell	Donovan	Irving
Barden	Dorn	Judd
Barrett	Doughton	Kelley, Pa.
Bow	Engle	Kennedy
Budge	Gillette	Kersten, Wis.
Burton	Golden	Kirwan
Camp	Gossett	Lyle
Cole, Kans.	Hall, Edwin	Miller, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Arthur	Murdock
Dawson	Harvey	Murray, Wis.
D'Ewart	Hébert	O'Brien, Mich.
Dingell	Hedrick	Potter

Powell
Regan
Rivers
Secrest
Shelley

Springer
Stigler
Sutton
Tackett
Taylor

Williams, Miss.
Willis
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDIA EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3791, with Mr. THOMAS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] provided my colleague on the majority side will also agree to yield him 1 minute, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order for the 2 minutes on a matter which he feels to be of vital importance.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to extend my gratitude to the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle for giving me this 2 minutes of time and permitting me to speak out of order.

Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago in a 1-minute speech I extended to the membership of the House and their wives a most cordial invitation on the part of the city of Norfolk to be the guests of that city at the forthcoming final Confederate reunion. That Confederate reunion will be held in Norfolk, Va., beginning on May 30 and extending through June 2.

The congressional part of this trip will begin on June 1 and will end on June 3. I hope the Members will listen because following my first invitation you received an official invitation and I want it distinctly understood that this invitation is extended to the Yankees with that delectable prefix just the same as it was to us Rebels and it not only extends to the Yankees but it includes their wives as well. They will receive a most cordial welcome down in my district.

May I call attention to some of the details that are involved?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman said something about the Yankees. Did he have a prefix to that?

Mr. HARDY. I said you could put that prefix on if you cared to.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I heard the gentleman say that the Yankees could bring their wives. Can the Yankees bring their husbands, too?

Mr. HARDY. Yes, by all means.

Transportation will be provided by air. Housing will be provided in Norfolk. We will leave Washington on June 1, returning on June 3. There will be some very interesting entertainment provided, including a trip to Fort Monroe for dedication of the Jefferson Davis casemate where he was imprisoned at Fort Monroe. Other features included the reenactment of the battle between the first two ironclad vessels, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, that just proves the generosity of my Yankee friends.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to point out that it is going to be a full period of activity, with reenactment of the battle between the first two ironclads. There is a most cordial welcome awaiting. But we do need to know who is going to make the trip and we need to know promptly in order that transportation arrangements may be made. I have arranged with the Sergeant at Arms office to receive acknowledgments and telephone calls from Members to indicate who will be there. But we must have this information by tomorrow. I think you received a card in the mail today, and if you have not returned it, please do so at once and let us know whether you can or cannot come.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, this matter which we are presently considering is a most important one. It has to do with our economy, our security, and our position in the world. Through all of my years in Congress it seems that we have been having such matters coming before us almost constantly. They present problems that disturb all of us. I think, however, that by and large we have sought to resolve those problems in the way that our conscience and our judgment dictated.

I voted for the rule yesterday for the consideration of this very important matter thereby providing for debate on and probable amendment of the measure. I sincerely hope that in the consideration of the measure before us we may work out such an approach as is beneficial not only to the people of India and their government but to the people of this country—an approach which contributes to our own security and strength. It is on such a basis that the great people who claim allegiance to my party, such as Mr. Herbert Hoover, and, I understand, most of the members of the committee on our side of the aisle, are supporting this measure—assuming, of course, that the measure can be worked out in a mutually satisfactory and

advantageous way. In that connection I know there are a good many who have high hopes that as this measure may finally evolve it can, to assist us in providing for our security both at home and abroad, make available materials that we vitally need.

Yesterday our distinguished Speaker reminded this body—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 22, 1951, page 5624:

If it had not been for Marshall aid in connection with the rehabilitation of Italy and France, those countries would today have been in the bosom of communism.

To me the distinguished Speaker's observation is a source of gratification, since the interim aid program for France and Italy, of which he speaks, was in fact made possible through the action of the Republican Eightieth Congress, in which I was privileged to serve as majority leader.

I think it is also worthy of note that the aid program for Greece and Turkey was brought to passage in that Congress, as was the program for economic assistance to Europe.

It was during the first session of the Eightieth Congress that Republicans passed a foreign-aid program involving funds in excess of \$2,000,000,000. During the second session we appropriated more than \$7,000,000,000 for these purposes in a broad program designed to help foreign nations preserve their independence against the threat of communism.

Moreover, and what is more germane to the current discussion, this money was appropriated by a Republican Congress to implement an effective program of recovery for Europe at a time when the administration had embarked upon a program which history has demonstrated was coddling, aiding, and abetting the enemies of freedom in Asia. I refer to the insistence of the State Department that the Communist Chinese were merely agrarian reformers who were entitled to a full voice in the government of Nationalist China.

I am certain a great many Members here today will vividly recall that the Eightieth Republican Congress also called for effective aid to Nationalist China at a time when such assistance had a reasonable chance of bearing the same fruits which have attended our efforts in Europe.

In that Congress we authorized \$570,000,000 of economic and military aid to China, in the same act with an ECA. I well recall the administration opponents of such action at that time said we were trying to sabotage the European-aid program. They said we could not put the program through on time if we included Greek-Turkey aid and aid to Nationalist China. But what are the facts? What does history record? It is that we put the combined one-package program through within the deadline set.

What, then, you may well ask, happened to this attempt on our part to correlate these programs of foreign aid for both the east and the west, reference to which two areas was made by the Speaker? After we provided such money on April 2, 1948, none of that military

aid that we authorized for China was extended until 8 months later. In that interim many battles against the Communist Chinese had been fought and lost.

The failure to properly administer the support to Asia and to China at a time when it would have been effective lies at the doorstep of an administration which was unwilling to effectively carry out the designs for the enterprise of restraining communism as it pertained to the Far East.

More than a year ago, almost 2 years ago, I was pointing out to the people of this country that the leaders of the Republican Party were consulted on the formation of an anti-Communist policy in Europe, and most of us supported that program, but we were never consulted on the policy in Asia, and we vigorously opposed that policy as it began to unfold.

This is what I said almost 2 years ago:

Today Manchuria is gone, China is gone, and the threat of communism is pointed straight at Burma, Indochina, Tibet, and Malaya, with India and the Philippines and all the rest of Asia as the final targets. Our abandonment of our China ally to the Soviet conspiracy is one of the great tragedies of all time.

Our distinguished Speaker pointed out yesterday that we need friends in the East—and he wondered if some gentlemen have forgotten that we need friends the world around, in the East as well as the West.

He could not have been directing his remarks to this side of the aisle, because the record is abundantly clear that the Republican Party has long since recognized the need for friends in all parts of the globe. It was in the light of this realization that Republicans in the Eightieth Congress predicated their program.

We recognized the value of the friendship of Nationalist China.

The administration insisted that we open the door to the "agrarian reformers" of Mao Tse-tung, the Communist.

What is the relative position of these people today?

Chiang Kai-shek and the forces of Nationalist China under him are bottled up on the island of Formosa by edict of our Government. Only at this late date is the administration recognizing the wisdom of lending aid in this direction. How far it will go I have no way of knowing.

On the other hand, where is the friendship the administration courted with Mao Tse-tung and his Communist legions? It is broken on the battlefields of Korea. Those "agrarian reformers" wooed by the State Department are killing our boys in Korea today.

My party needs no reminder that America needs friends around the world. Our Republican declaration of foreign policy at the time of the Eightieth Congress was this:

We support the United Nations Organization for international peace. * * * We support the indispensable inter-American system as a regional part of the international organization. * * * We will engage in essential international relief as a humanitarian obligation and to prevent chaos through misery.

In foreign affairs the Republican Eightieth Congress did, indeed, comply with all its constitutional responsibilities. It did, indeed, strive for an enduring world peace.

In the light of this record of the Republican Eightieth Congress I thank our distinguished Speaker for calling the attention of this membership to the effectiveness of the program we made possible in the interests of the peoples of free Europe and of Greece and Turkey.

And in the light of the great tragedy which has befallen us in Asia I regret that the administration did not see fit at the proper time to conscientiously execute the will of the Republican Eightieth Congress in respect to our program for the strengthening of a free and independent Asia.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that in the discussions on measures of this nature we must seemingly stand naked before the world. We voice our opinions about our neighbors who live with us in this close, compact community of nations, and sometimes our remarks are not complimentary. I do not know of a remedial answer. It is our way of doing things, but obviously we over-indulge at times in this respect. Never before, for instance, in the history of any nation have we held a council of war in front of our enemies as is now in process in other parts of this Capitol. I am applying my statements to a condition rather than as a criticism toward individuals.

The system under which we operate, with all the activity which the meaning of freedom embraces, together with our rather candid nature and disposition, in the heat of discussions we often exercise little restraint. In the early years of our Government, and, in fact, until comparatively recent times, the freedom of discussions on the floor of this Congress usually applied to domestic issues. We were not globally involved, but since becoming thus involved, our responsibility in this respect has become much greater.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to be moderate and considerate in my remarks, although it does become necessary to discuss the attitude of India and particularly a short reference to the philosophy of Mr. Nehru.

However, I want to make a general reference to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who has just preceded me. I want to parenthetically add that to me it is also regrettable to deal in hindsight alone, unless it is a positive factor to avoid mistakes in the future. In other words, much of what the gentleman has just said suggests a political approach rather than a constructive answer to the many questions involved in the legislation before us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall try as best I can to pick up the continuity of the discussion we had on this bill yesterday.

First, I want to take occasion to correct the RECORD of yesterday when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Rules Committee, stated that this bill came out of the Foreign Affairs Committee by unanimous vote. I voted against this bill in the committee and also opposed the first bill which was presented to the Rules Committee, but which was rejected.

Incidentally, it was probably not known to the Rules Committee when it rejected the original bill, known as the Morgan bill, that the majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee would pass out any sort of measure and the form—that is, grant or loan—was not determining. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] will probably want to bear this action in mind for future reference.

As a matter of fact, I agree in some respects with the majority on the Committee that if a bill must be produced, it makes little difference whether it is on a loan or on a grant basis. That will indicate how much I think of the worthiness of the loan. If I were for the bill, the loan feature, under the circumstances, would be a subterfuge.

As a compliment to the staff of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I say this in all sincerity and with no facetiousness whatever—they were able to produce for the committee an able argument in the first instance that a loan to India was not a good loan. When it was decided the aid provided in this legislation would be on the basis of a loan, they were then able to produce a strong argument substantiating that viewpoint. Here is the language of the first proposition—that is, when it called for a grant:

The committee gave special consideration to the question of whether the aid requested by India should be made available as a loan "on special and easy terms," as requested by the Indian Government, or as an outright grant. The committee believes that a loan would be an unrealistic approach to the problem. It would be contrary to the firmly established policy of the United States not to make loans where there is no reasonable expectation that they can be repaid. Furthermore, a loan that can not be repaid engenders ill will instead of creating goodwill.

After the Rules Committee refused to grant a rule providing aid on a grant basis, the committee then rewrote loan provisions or provisions for repayment. Then, our staff, at the request of the committee, of course, had to say this in the report:

There is no question of India's ability to service a loan of the size authorized by this bill. The most conservative estimates indicate that at the present time, India's excess reserves over requirement is equivalent to about \$500,000,000.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CHATHAM. The gentleman said it was his opinion that this was put on a loan basis as a subterfuge.

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will pardon me, I said that if I had supported both propositions which have been involved in this effort, I would feel my action to be a subterfuge. Please understand me. I do not mean that the gentleman is a party to a subterfuge.

His views are his own and I respect them. I am sure he will be as liberal with me.

Mr. CHATHAM. I do not believe any member of the Foreign Affairs Committee was a party to a subterfuge.

Mr. BURLESON. And I did not intend to indicate such. If I were supporting this bill and that was the route I had to take, if that was the thing which had to convince me of the worthiness of the loan, I would consider it a sop. If I were trying to justify the fact to my people back home that this is a worthy loan, I would want more than I have yet seen produced on which to base my support.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Just on the basis of facts and nothing else, it is a fact that when we were discussing this idea of a grant we all knew that if we made a grant to India that would help them in their development plan. In other words, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] so eloquently explained, food would be eaten up within a year, and it would not represent a tangible, permanent asset. Hence, if you drew down the money in terms of a loan, you would reduce the capability of India to pursue her own development plans. If you give it to them as a grant, you would not impair their financial position to pursue their own development. I think that is a fair explanation.

Mr. BURLESON. I trust the gentleman will not take too much of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. I would just like to point out one other significant fact to the folks back home. I got this from the International Bank this morning. India has never defaulted on any external debt. Is it not fair to say that that is a mighty good debt record and a mighty good precursor for a loan?

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman knows that India has not had an opportunity very long to incur debts on her own, nor has any debt come due which she must meet and repay.

Mr. JAVITS. She has been under the British constantly as a dominion, and she has never defaulted on a debt.

Mr. BURLESON. I have no quarrel with the matter of India's good intention and her past performance, but say the least, she has not assumed very much responsibility in this respect and therefore has scant record which can point to future possibilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to a few things which I think will be of interest to the House in considering these matters before us. First, there is the military operation of India in Kashmir. It is my information that it is costing the Indian Government a sum approximating the cost of the grain which we propose to send them under this legislation. As you know, the dispute between India and Pakistan involving the territory of Kashmir is of long standing. Pakistan has shown great improvement since her independence and is a friend of the United States. India claims Kashmir is opposed to Pakistan, and maintains forces to hold that State and denies the request of the United Nations to pull her troops out in order that a free

and unhindered election can be held. My argument is not for Pakistan as opposed to India, but if India can afford to maintain her present military operation in this respect, she might afford to spend money for food for her starving people.

Considerable discussion was had yesterday on the philosophies and attitude of Mr. Nehru toward the western countries on the one hand, and those countries embracing communism on the other. I doubt if the American mind can understand Mr. Nehru, but it is my conception that has one foot firmly planted in Gandhism and the other in the materialism manifested by India's action in Kashmir and also in Mr. Nehru's attitude, and others of his Government, toward western civilization. In other words, he wants his cake and eat it too.

Is there real suffering and real famine in India? Doubtless there is. There always has been. Since 1803, as far back as the record is clear, there has been a famine in India on the average of about every 7 years. Now if we are wrong in meeting such a condition on a humanitarian basis today, our forefathers were negligent men also, and did not heed the need of the suffering. Poverty and disease are a common thing in India, as everyone knows, but on May 1 in a speech, Mr. Nehru had this to say:

We have large areas in India today which are deficient in food and some which hover on the verge of famine, and yet there are also other parts of India which have produced surplus food grains. Taking India as a whole, the deficit is not so great as imagined. We can only meet this crisis by pooling all our resources and using them to the best advantage all over India. It would be shameful to all of us if some people die of lack of food while others have abundance of it; if some of the states have to face widespread undernourishment and starvation while others have a surplus.

So, in Mr. Nehru's own words on May 1, he does not despair of the situation in India to the extent which has been expressed here on the floor of this House during this debate. He was appealing to those areas of India which had a surplus of food grains to share it with those who had none. As I understand it, he had recently made a rather extended trip over India and found that in the States of Bihar and Madras the deficit in food was rather severe; whereas in other parts, for instance in Uttar Pradesh, a great grain and rice producing area, supplies of food grains were on hand and in surplus. Now, Mr. Chairman, if India is unable to make distribution of food among her peoples with some supplies on hand, how can we expect them to do so with grains shipped to the Indian ports? As you know, India is a country of tremendous area. Transportation and communication facilities are very poor. That is one of their problems. It is not the problem we have under consideration here. Therefore, I doubt if the intents in this legislation can physically be brought about.

Some of you on the floor of this House, like myself, have been in the Far East. Some of you, like myself, served in the Armed Forces in that part of the world and saw how things were done. You

may, for instance, have seen the operation of UNRRA, which resulted in those who had, having more, and those who had not, still having not. I fear the result in India would be the same under this system. Under this bill, as has been pointed up here in the debate, we have nothing to do with the distribution, and in this respect I would have preferred the measure which provided the assistance as an outright grant. If it were a grant, we could at least supervise the distribution and see that it was used for the purpose intended. We have no strings on the \$190,000,000 which we would spend under this measure.

In connection with food supply, let me say a word to those of you who evidently have the impression that surplus grain in this country is running out of our ears. When representatives of the Agricultural Department, the Farm Bureau, and other farm organizations appeared before our committee testifying in behalf of this bill, they referred to the good grain prospects at that time. Mind you, this was in February. I questioned these officials of the farm organizations and the United States Department of Agriculture on the matter of good grain prospects in the Southwest and the great wheat producing areas in the Midwest. I reminded them of the severe drought which existed, which has not yet in many places been broken. They contended the winter wheat prospect was good. Subsequent reports have proved just how wrong they were, and now they simply say that spring wheat prospects are good, and maybe they are, but much can happen. Now, if the world was unfortunate enough to be plunged into an all-out war, tremendous demands would be made upon us for food grains. This country would have to supply many troops. If we can't protect this country from every conceivable eventuality, how can we expect to protect some other nation which could not and would not contribute anything in such a war?

This is not a humanitarian proposition. No one could hold greater compassion for suffering people than I, and I know that every Member of this Congress likewise feels compassion for unfortunate people, but I repeat, this is not a humanitarian measure. It is political as surely as we sit here, and it is not the policy of this country to abolish poverty wherever it is. If it were the policy, it would be an impossibility. The United States of America cannot continue indefinitely to feed half the world and fight the other half. This action, if it passes, is an invitation to every nation in the world to appeal for help in the form of loans, and they likely will do so. In other aid programs there has been a tangibility. For instance, the \$50,000,000 aid to Yugoslavia which we passed near the close of the last session of Congress was a gamble that Yugoslavia's 32 divisions, fairly well armed and equipped, would be on our side in case trouble developed with Russia. That is a tangible asset. Other aid programs have likewise had some such tangibility, the degree of which was estimated in some form or other. I repeat, there is no tangibility

in this respect in India. India has no intent of assisting this Government, even by its moral support, and she has no physical support. In a few days from now, the State of Israel will be requesting a loan of something over \$125,000,000. What can you say to Israel if you approve this loan to India? What can you say to the Arab states, Africa, the southeast Asian states—as to that matter, any country in the world with whom we have a semblance of friendship? If it is the policy of this country to take care of all unfortunate people of the world, we should have given aid to little El Salvador, which a few days ago suffered a devastating earthquake in which more than 1,200 people were killed and an inestimable amount of property destroyed. We passed a resolution a few days ago, and I understand it has now passed the other body, in connection with El Salvador's disaster. You know what we gave them, do you not? We gave them sympathy. I voted for it. I would also vote to extend that much to India or any other part of the world. In 1949 a severe earthquake laid waste to a great area in Ecuador. They needed \$5,000,000. I saw that area and walked over a considerable part of it. The American Red Cross was doing and did a wonderful job. The American Government gave nothing. They are not going Communist and we have their friendship.

By this action, I cannot believe we will guarantee the friendship of the Government of India or the Indian people. Neither do I believe we can buy our way around this world. We cannot continue to place the heavy burden of taxation upon our people and to flagrantly throw our resources to the far corners of this world and expect to remain strong. We can maintain a stability in this world by our strength, which certainly cannot be maintained if we ever become weak. We are the only people who can maintain it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Texas has raised through his remarks some question about the need for assistance in India. I have studied the evidence taken before the committee. It seems to me that the evidence conclusively justifies and establishes a case. But I have here a statement by the Catholic Association for International Peace dated February 16, which states in part:

The Indian Government requests 2,000,000 tons of food grains from the United States as the minimum to continue the ration in 1951 at the level prevailing in 1950 to build back India's depleted grain reserves to a minimum safe level. The Indian Government bases this request for aid on the contention that summer floods, earthquakes, and fall droughts have critically reduced domestic grain supplies.

So far as can presently be ascertained, summer floods in some areas did wipe out grain reserves held by Indian farmers and destroyed seed stocks as well. Earthquakes

did destroy some villages and otherwise hampered production.

But most importantly, in some of the principal rice-growing provinces, autumn rainfall was far below normal, with very serious effects upon rice production.

The evidence on these points appears to be conclusive. So, too, is the evidence that the people of India are faced with a dangerous grain shortage unless additional imports are provided—though there is lack of full agreement as to how bad the situation actually is.

I think it is on that that there is some honest misunderstanding. Continuing:

It would appear to be significant, however, that the per capita daily grain ration has been reduced by 25 percent in Bombay and other ration areas.

Representatives of all religions favor the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the remarks of my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and I want to compliment him on the speech he made. There were some parts of it, of course, with regard to which an honest difference of opinion could exist. But I am not going to make any reference to them because I feel it would be unjustifiable on my part on this occasion. We in the House have always had a fairly good bipartisan relationship, never seriously impaired, and the substance of the speech of the gentleman from Indiana, in my opinion, is to strengthen the bipartisan relationship that should exist in both branches of the Congress in connection with foreign affairs. My comment is one, if I will not be put in a false position of trying to say something pleasant because I admire my friend even when we disagree, of commendation because as I listened to the speech the gentleman made it was of a strengthening nature and the few comments he made upon which there might be some honest disagreement were pertinent from his angle but from my angle it would be unjustifiable for me to undertake to differentiate on this occasion.

In the consideration of the bill before us, I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should realize the people of India are emerging from a long period of struggle and frustration. We are a nation of one-hundred-and-sixty-odd years of existence. We know the trying days of our own Nation as we study the history of our early constitutional days. Here is a people and a Nation that have just emerged from colonial control, exploitation as they believe, and we must expect that that long period of struggle and frustration is going to leave its imprint for some little time to come. We must realize that the feelings of generations cannot be forgotten in a few years.

We should also appreciate that the Chinese Communist invasion of Tibet presents new problems to India and undoubtedly has and will continue to produce a profound change in the state of mind of responsible leaders of India. As I view the situation, there is no question but what the threat of Communist aggression has produced unrest in India, particularly due to the Red Communists going into Tibet. The Communist invasion of Tibet at least must cause

India to recognize its significance and its potential threat to India.

Let us not overlook in the consideration of this bill the fact that in an official statement the Chinese Communist News Agency not so long ago called Nehru the running dog of American and British imperialism.

We must recognize with an understanding that to the people of India the white soldiery for generations are to them the symbol of oppression and exploitation. Whether it be a fact or not, that was their feeling and is still their feeling. Whether or not this opinion was right or justified is immaterial. It exists so far as the people of India are concerned. They feel they are justified in entertaining such feelings and opinions.

As I read the newspapers of India, particularly in recent months, I cannot fail to note a marked swing to a more favorable comment on Indian-American relations; also to note the increasing critical comment on Communist expansion in Asia. We must also realize that there are other officials and persons in India than Mr. Nehru. And I do not want any remarks I make today to be used abroad for propaganda purposes by the Communists or anyone else, so I shall express myself in a restrained manner. But I think that Mr. Nehru is not the issue. Assuming the strongest case is made against him, as evidence by some of the statements made by colleagues of mine, I do not consider Mr. Nehru to be the issue.

The issue is whether or not there is starvation facing those people. That to me is the primary call. Charity means something to me. I am not going to give a sermon because in my little humble way I try to live up as a human being to what I believe in. But those of us who believe in God know that He and His Holy Son, the Redeemer, has told us the greatest possession we can have is charity. I recognize we cannot bring about a utopia in the world, and the remarks of my friend from Texas are pertinent in that respect. Nevertheless, where we can we should not close our eyes to suffering humanity. The only crime they committed is that they were born in India. None of us was consulted when we were brought onto this earth as to our racial origin, to our parents, to our color, as to where we should be born, and we are very fortunate that we were born in the United States; at least, I consider that I was very fortunate that I was born in the United States, and I will make a public confession that God has particularly blessed me in giving me at birth the dear mother that he did. What would be our feeling if we were born abroad, in India or behind the iron curtain, and we wanted freedom? We do not believe in communism; we are against it. But we must stand for something. We stand for the dignity of the individual. Our civilization and our way of life represents something to stand for. I am not against communism alone; I am for something, and when I am for the things I believe in, I am against communism. We will never meet the problems of the

day being against something all the time and being on the defensive. I try to live up to my own little way as a human being in the things I believe in. I believe in God, for example. I believe in a government of laws that can only exist where there are people who believe in God. We may differ about this or that proposition, but we all believe in the dignity of the individual. That is a spiritual gift. You could not have that under communism, where there is hatred, and where the origin is hate. So, we stand for something, and in order to stand for something we have got to do those things that will convey to other people the fact that we do stand for something. As I view this bill, we are conveying to the people of India and the people of the world that America stands for great ideas, not only spiritually, but governmentally, and our governmental ideas are the result of the spiritual ideals we believe in. I lay my support of this bill on the ground of charity, God-given charity. Out of it will flow many other things. I recognize the intemperate statements made by some of the officials of India, but let us not forget, as I said, that for generations they have been under the control of the white soldiery. I hope Mr. Nehru will not think all persons of the white race are like those that he thinks persecuted him. If he is going to have a feeling against every member of the white race because of what he has undergone, he is wrong. That is not the right way to think. That is not the right way for anyone to think. But, in the passage of this bill we are making a great contribution, one that is related to deep values, and in my opinion will bring not only immediate, but long-range understanding and a better understanding between the people of India and America, and that it will have far-reaching effects among all other peoples of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass without any crippling amendments.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to most of the debate yesterday and today I have the feeling that we are basing the need for the program in the present bill on the ground that there is acute starvation and great distress in India. I believe it is incumbent upon the proponents of the legislation to show that such is the fact. I think there is serious doubt about that. For the sake of the record, I want to bring to bear in support of my doubts the very statement of Mr. Nehru, the leader of India. I do that by referring to certain excerpts from a radio talk he gave to the Indian people on the 1st of May 1951—this year. He starts out by saying:

I am going to speak to you about the food situation in our country. What do those words convey to you? They might mean just some slight maladjustment which we should try to remedy, or they might mean starvation and famine for larger numbers of our countrymen. Let us try to understand objectively what exactly the situation is. On one hand we have exaggerated reports of famine conditions prevailing over wide areas and deaths from starvation. On the other hand, an attempt is made to minimize the

gravity of the situation. The truth lies somewhere between the two and is bad enough. There are in India today wide areas, more especially in the states of Bihar and Madras, where food is lacking and is supplied in insufficient quantities and hence there is continuous undernourishment. Some are unable to bear this strain for long and weaken and collapse. Famine, as we have grown to understand this awful word does not exist to any wide extent at this stage. But the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land.

I quote again:

While we welcome all the help we can get from foreign countries, we have made it clear that such help must not have any political strings attached to it, any conditions which are unbecoming for a self-respecting nation to accept, any pressure to change our domestic or international policy. We would be unworthy of the high responsibilities with which we have been charged if we bartered away in the slightest degree our country's self-respect or freedom of action, even for something which we need so badly.

I shall not deal here with the wider and more basic problem of food in India, although that must be understood by us all in its implications; nor will I say much at this stage about the intimate connection of the food problem with that of the growth of population, both human beings and animals. It is clear to me that we cannot ultimately tackle the food problem by itself, ignoring these other factors.

We have large areas in India today which are deficient in food and some which hover on the verge of famine, and yet there are also other parts of India which produce surplus foodgrains. Taking India as a whole, the deficit is not so great as imagined. We can only meet this crisis by pooling all our resources and using them to the best advantage all over India. It would be shameful to all of us if some people die of lack of food while others have abundance of it; if some of the states have to face widespread undernourishment and starvation while others have a surplus. There is heavy responsibility at this moment on those states or areas which are described surplus, for it is to them that we must look to supply the need of those who lack food. We cannot think any more in narrow terms of our own particular state and ignore the agonizing call from a sister state. We have to realize that whatever help may or may not come from abroad, the burden and responsibility rests upon all of us and if any part of India goes down, we go down with it. In this, as in other matters, India is one and we must function therefore as a united whole.

I quote again:

I have learned with surprise and distress that some people are coming in the way of procurement and are actually preaching against it—

I might say, parenthetically, that this word "procurement" means coming into the production of grain.

If they think that the manner or method of procurement is not right, they have every justification for trying to rectify it or to improve it, but to say or do anything which hinders procurement is to invite famine and death for our people.

Procurement therefore must have first place.

Mind you, he also says this:

The new wheat is coming in and it is our good fortune that the crop has been on the whole a good one. Let us make the best of it and pour out this life-giving substance to those from whom life might be ebbing away. Let us all function with efficiency and integrity and not allow either

our self-interest or our greed for profit or the red tape of official machinery to come in the way of speedy and adequate relief.

Quoting again:

I am sure that our people, as soon as they realize the nature of the crisis will cooperate in this common endeavor and not seek private profit out of their neighbor's misfortune. If any still continue to hoard, the committee should bring this matter to public notice. Some gifts of food grains have been made to me and I have welcomed them. I know that these gifts do not go a long way toward solving the national problem, but they are of importance in creating that atmosphere of self-help and cooperation which is so necessary today.

Mr. Chairman, what did Nehru say about starvation and famine? Briefly, I want to sum up in four points what he said because it has a direct bearing upon the charge that there is great suffering and that there is great danger that there will be a very extreme famine condition. Here are Nehru's own words, and I quote again:

Famine, as we have grown to understand this awful word does not exist to any wide extent at this stage. But the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land.

Again I quote:

We have large areas in India today which are deficient in food and some which hover on the verge of famine, and yet there are also other parts of India which produce surplus food grains. Taking India as a whole, the deficit is not so great as imagined.

Quoting further:

The new wheat is coming in and it is our good fortune that the crop has been on the whole a good one.

I am sure that our people, as soon as they realize the nature of the crisis, will cooperate in this common endeavor and not seek private profit out of their neighbor's misfortune. If any still continue to hoard, the committee should bring this matter to public notice. Some gifts of food grains have been made to me and I have welcomed them. I know that these gifts do not go a long way toward solving the national problem, but they are of importance in creating that atmosphere of self-help and cooperation which is so necessary today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this statement by Nehru himself should be persuasive in indicating to us that while there may be some danger of extreme suffering and hardship, the problem is not as acute as it has been painted by this legislation. This legislation refers to "emergency need arising from external sequence of floods, drought, and other natural disasters." Mr. Nehru is absolutely silent about that. Is it not strange that he has failed to do so.

I have a feeling that this program is not one that was designed originally to take care of the need that has been set forth in the legislation, but rather it was originally conceived to gain the good will of Mr. Nehru, and that is political and not economic. That is the situation as I see it today.

Of course, we know that while there may be a condition that is going to be bad, we also know that Nehru is preach-

ing to his people the concept that if they are ultimately to overcome this condition which faces them almost annually, it is a matter which they themselves must solve. This is an agricultural problem for the people of India.

There are many things that might be said, that the food grains that are short today are being consumed by animals, which could well take care of any need the Indian people have today. We do not like to talk about that kind of a situation because it is an internal problem; but, after all, we are the ones who are going to foot this bill. I sympathize with, and I support as a matter of fact, the idea that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLISON] referred to when he addressed the Committee a few minutes ago. The question in my mind is, how far we are going to continue this kind of operation now before us? Are we going to try to take care of famine conditions all over the world? Are we going to assume the responsibility of arming nations all over the world? I do not know how you may feel about this, but, as far as I am concerned, my first responsibility is to my own country. We are in bad financial condition, confronted with higher taxes, economic controls, and diminishing consumer goods. In other words our standard of living is going down.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it not known to the gentleman that there are a flock of countries sitting on the steps of the Capitol now expecting to come to your committee for hand-outs in the event you adopt this Indian bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. COX. In other words, the information that I have, and it is reliable, is that it totals \$7,000,000,000. When are we to end this give-away program, if we expect this country to survive?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I can only say this to the gentleman, that we had better end it now or the voters will take care of us in the next election.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to read two sentences from the official India News Bulletin issued by the Embassy of India, Washington, D. C., February 16, 1951, page 7:

It might also be pointed out that jute is one of India's most important industries which earns nearly 45 percent of her dollar exchange. India can hardly afford to starve it.

In other words, while the people starve it is perfectly all right says the Indian Government, to divert acreage from production of food crops to jute, in order to profit by it, regardless of human misery and starvation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In that connection I might say that there was a reduction in the acreage for the production of food grains to the extent of 1,200,000 acres this year. That all goes to this problem.

I think India is big enough and resourceful enough to work itself out of this problem without reliance upon the United States of America. That is the position of Mr. Nehru and it is an admirable one and I commend him for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Laying aside the charity involved in this and the payment involved, let me ask the gentleman this question: Assuming that this deal is made in accordance with the provisions of this bill and a loan is facilitated through the machinery of the Export-Import Bank, in the gentleman's opinion will that loan be as sound as similar loans made through the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to insert in the RECORD—and for this I have secured permission in the House—the speech by Mr. Nehru on May 1, and also an article from the New York Times of May 2, on this question entitled "Nehru Bars Food With Strings."

(The matter referred to follows:)

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER NEHRU BROADCAST OVER ALL-INDIA RADIO MAY 1, 1951

I am going to speak to you about the food situation in our country. What do those words convey to you? They might mean just some slight maladjustment which we should try to remedy, or they might mean starvation and famine for larger number of our countrymen. Let us try to understand objectively what exactly the situation is. On one hand we have exaggerated reports of famine conditions prevailing over wide areas and deaths from starvation. On the other hand, an attempt is made to minimize the gravity of the situation. The truth lies somewhere between the two and is bad enough. There are in India today wide areas, more especially the instates of Bihar and Madras, where food is lacking and is supplied in insufficient quantities and hence there is continuous undernourishment. Some are unable to bear this strain for long and weaken and collapse. Famine, as we have grown to understand this awful word does not exist to any wide extent at this stage. But the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land.

What, then, are we going to do about it? We cannot look on while tragedy develops. We cannot live our everyday lives when starvation and death march with stealthy steps toward many of our people. There are many important and even vital problems confronting us in the international and domestic sphere, but there is nothing more vital or of greater importance today than to meet this menace of famine. What are our brave schemes worth if we cannot even save our people from that worst of fates—death by slow starvation? It serves little purpose to spend our time apportioning blame. We have to be up and doing to meet and counter this danger that confronts our people. Each one of us must realize what is happening and what is likely to happen. Each one of us must do his bit to prevent this happening. We have to face a very difficult situation, and I do not want anyone to minimize this difficulty. Nevertheless, I am convinced that we can face it successfully if only we show awareness and determination to do our utmost to crush the evil which threatens to overwhelm us. Let us declare war on famine and all of its brood.

This is not a question of politics or economics on which there can be any difference

of opinion. Only the small in mind can try to take advantage or worse still, try to aggravate this situation for political purposes. If we cannot pull together in this matter, then indeed, we are men and women of petty statute who cannot rise to any occasion or any crisis.

We have tried our utmost to procure food grains from distant countries. We have purchased them to the utmost of our capacity, and ship after ship is coming in laden with this precious commodity and yet this is not enough and we have tried and are trying to get more. I should like to express my appreciation and gratitude to the many countries which have helped us in this matter: To the United States of America, which has the good fortune to have abundant supplies and which has also provided us with ships for transport; to China, which in spite of its own need has already sent us several shiploads and which is going to send us more; to Soviet Russia, which I hope will also be sending us wheat before long. I should like also to express my appreciation of the help given us by the Government of the United Kingdom in securing ships which we so badly need. Above all, I should like to express my deep gratitude to innumerable individuals in various countries, to the common man everywhere for not only his sympathy in our misfortune but also his desire to help to the best of his ability. In the United States of America, a nonofficial emergency committee which was formed for this purpose has done excellent work.

While we welcome all the help we can get from foreign countries, we have made it clear that such help must not have any political strings attached to it, any conditions which are unbecoming for a self-respecting nation to accept, any pressure to change our domestic or international policy. We would be unworthy of the high responsibilities with which we have been charged if we bartered away in the slightest degree our country's self-respect or freedom of action, even for something which we need so badly.

I shall not deal here with the wider and more basic problem of food in India, although that must be understood by us in all its implications; nor will I say much at this stage about the intimate connection of the food problem with that of the growth of population, both human beings and animals. It is clear to me that we cannot ultimately tackle the food problem by itself, ignoring these other factors.

We have sought help from abroad, as needs we must, and we shall continue to do so under pressure of necessity, but the conviction is growing upon me more forcibly than ever how dangerous it is for us to depend for this primary necessity of life on foreign countries. We can never function with the freedom that we desire if we are always dependent in this matter on others. It is only when we obtain self-sufficiency in food that we can progress and develop our policies. Otherwise, there is the continuous pressure of circumstance, there is trouble and misery and there is sometimes shame and humiliation.

We have large areas in India today which are deficient in food and some which hover on the verge of famine, and yet there are also other parts of India which produce surplus food grains. Taking India as a whole, the deficit is not so great as imagined. We can only meet this crisis by pooling all our resources and using them to the best advantage all over India. It would be shameful to all of us if some people die of lack of food while others have abundance of it; if some of the states have to face widespread undernourishment and starvation while others have a surplus. There is heavy responsibility at this moment on those states or areas which are described surplus, for it is to them that we must look to supply the need of those who lack food. We cannot,

think any more in narrow terms of our own particular state and ignore the agonizing call from a sister state. We have to realize that whatever help may or may not come from abroad, the burden and responsibility rest upon all of us and if any part of India goes down, we go down with it. In this, as in other matters, India is one and we must function therefore as a united whole.

Two days ago I visited the district of Bulandshahr Uttar Pradesh. From the point of view of food, it is relatively more fortunate. When I told the people there of the sufferings of their brothers and sisters in Bihar or far off Madras, they were moved and immediately, without my asking for it, many offered their help and their gifts. This spontaneous gesture affected me deeply, and I realized that if only our people knew what the facts were, they would come to the rescue even at a sacrifice for themselves.

The immediate need is procurement of food grains. This has to be pushed to the utmost extent. There may be gifts, and we shall welcome them, but ultimately it is the amount of food grains that we procure that will make a difference. If this is so, then it becomes of essential importance for all of us to work our hardest to procure more than we have ever done in the past. This becomes the duty of our administration and of the trader and of the farmer and the peasant in the field. At this moment for any person to hoard or to speculate on food is a crime and a disgrace. If we think too much of our tomorrows and the day after, what of those who may see no tomorrow?

I have learned with surprise and distress that some people are coming in the way of procurement and are actually preaching against it. If they think that the manner or method of procurement is not right, they have every justification for trying to rectify it or to improve it, but to say or do anything which hinders procurement is to invite famine and death for our people.

Procurement therefore must have first place. The new wheat is coming in and it is our good fortune that the crop has been on the whole a good one. Let us make the best of it and pour out this life-giving substance to those from whom life might be ebbing away. Let us all function with efficiency and integrity and not allow either our self-interest or our greed for profit or the red tape of official machinery to come in the way of speedy and adequate relief.

What else can we do? Perhaps you know that our Army has offered help in the distribution of food or otherwise. We welcome that offer, because our Army is efficient and disciplined and I am sure that the help they give us will be valuable. I welcome it even more because I should like our Army to be not only the brave defenders of our freedom from external aggression, but also efficient servants of the people who can always be called upon in time of need. The Army and the people are one, and they must help each other.

In some of the areas that have been badly affected, notably in Bihar and parts of Madras, unemployment has grown and the purchasing power is vanishing so that even if foodgrains are available, there is no money to buy them. In these areas, it is important and urgent to start public works and to give relief and some purchasing power. These public works can be of many kinds. Primarily, they should concern themselves with growing more food wherever this is possible or any other kinds of works of permanent value. Wells can be made, village tanks can be dug and cleaned, roads can be constructed.

There must be many young men including students in our colleges and universities as well as in higher classes, secondary schools, for whom such labor should be welcome both from national and individual points of view. Personally, I have long been convinced that our educational process is incomplete unless

the student has put in manual labor of some kind, and I hope that the time may come when a course of such labor should be made an essential part of school and college education, without which no degrees or diplomas can be given. Participation in such labor should be made compulsory. The practical effect of this will be appreciable. The psychological effect would be even more important, but, above all, this will result in improving the quality of the younger generation and making them fitter for any task that they might subsequently undertake. For them to throw themselves in a disciplined and organized way into this work of food production and relief as well as of public works in aid of it would have a tremendous effect on the Nation. Such work cannot be undertaken spasmodically and should be carefully organized and supervised. No person who is not earnest about it and hard working should undertake it.

We have large schemes for growing more food which are run under official auspices. Let the people start their small schemes on their own initiative and grow food wherever they can manage to do so—parks, gardens, uncultivated land in rural areas, compounds or public institutions, and private residences.

In any organized scheme for procurement or distribution, Government agencies must necessarily function, but that is not enough and it should be supplemented by private agency in a hundred ways. I suggest that each village should form a small committee of its own whose function should be to help every person in that village. That committee should assume responsibility for the village and those who lack food should be supported by those who have a little surplus. Of course, where necessary, official help will be given, but the village should function as a cooperative unit in this matter and the committee should also see to it that there is no hoarding by anyone in that village. I am sure that our people, as soon as they realize the nature of the crisis, will cooperate in this common endeavor and not seek private profit out of their neighbor's misfortune. If any still continue to hoard, the committee should bring this matter to public notice. Some gifts of foodgrains have been made to me and I have welcomed them. I know that these gifts do not go a long way toward solving the national problem, but they are of importance in creating that atmosphere of self-help and cooperation which is so necessary today. Therefore I should like to encourage such gifts. Naturally, any foodgrains sent as a gift will not be sold. They will be distributed free to those who stand in need of them. They will be sent to areas most affected in Bihar and Madras. I suggest that the district magistrate of the area concerned be informed of these gifts and he can make arrangements for their dispatch according to directions.

When we are seeking to make the most of every ounce of foodgrains that we have, can there be greater folly, if not much worse, than waste? We are a people whose social habits have encouraged waste. This must be considered as an offense against common decency and must be stopped.

May I suggest also that each one of us should demonstrate active sympathy and a desire to help by giving up one meal a week. This is no great sacrifice for anyone. Let the foodgrains so saved be collected and sent as gifts in the manner I have suggested above.

If this is done in any adequate measure as it should be, then we have conquered and survived this food crisis.

I have ventured to place before you certain suggestions for action. I want you to have not only an intellectual appreciation of the situation in India, but also emotional awareness of the tragedy that fast approaches us. I want you to look upon it as something intimately affecting you and not as some dis-

tant occurrence with which you have little concern. I want you above all to think of common Mother India, whose children we are, of her honor and self-respect and of her distress in the agony of many of her children. Let us put all our resources, all our strength and energy in this war against famine which we must and will win.

[From the New York Times May 2, 1951]

NEHRU BARS FOOD WITH ANY "STRINGS"—SAYS INDIA WILL NOT BARTER FREEDOM OF ACTION—UNITED STATES BILL IS CAUSING RESENTMENT

NEW DELHI, INDIA, May 1.—Prime Minister Jawaharal Nehru declared today that India, though grateful for help, would not accept food from any country if it had "any political strings attached to it."

Reviewing the food situation in a Nation-wide broadcast, he added: "We would be unworthy of the high responsibilities with which we have been charged if we bartered away in the slightest degree our country's self-respect or freedom of action even for something which we need so badly."

Indian opinion strongly supports Nehru's view. Every important newspaper published today official and parliamentary reactions to the speech by Mr. Nehru on Sunday in which he expressed a similar view.

FOOD POLICY BEING RESHAPED

According to the newspapers, the general reaction was that the conditions in the United States Senate bill on aid to India were so obnoxious that the Government of India had decided not to rely any longer on 2,000,000 tons of United States grain and that the food importing policy was being recast. A large section of parliamentary opinion, according to reports, favored rejection of American help even if it materialized ultimately.

An official of the Food Ministry said these reports were rather speculative and that government was not committed to any policy of outright rejection of United States help.

Strong exception has been taken to three conditions in the Senate bill. These would require India (1) to distribute supplies obtained locally or imported without discrimination as to caste, color, or creed, (2) give full and continuous publicity in India for American assistance and (3) permit unrestricted observation of distributions by Americans.

Officials here expressed the view that all three conditions in the Senate bill were being voluntarily observed, but that writing them into an agreement was objectionable. Meanwhile the food problem has been placed on a war footing and is being dealt with by a special cabinet subcommittee that meets every day.

AIMS AT SELF-SUFFICIENCY

In his broadcast the Prime Minister warned his countrymen of the "dangerous consequences inherent in constant dependence upon outside help for food."

"We have sought help from abroad and we shall continue to do so under pressure of necessity," he said.

"But we can never function with the freedom that we desire if we are always dependent in this matter on others. It is only when we obtain self-sufficiency in food that we can progress and develop our politics."

Famine as it is understood by the people does not exist to any wide extent at this stage, he said, adding, "but the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land." He said he emphasized the need for intensification of internal procurement measures and for starting urgently a number of public works to increase the purchasing power of the poor.

Communist China has agreed to supply India immediately with 50,000 tons more of rice, according to information received from

Peiping, an official of the Food Ministry said today. This is the second agreement concluded with China within the last 4 days. Last week it was announced that Peiping had agreed to supply 50,000 tons of milo sorghum grain.

At the same time the Chinese Government has made arrangements to ship the 100,000 tons of grain as speedily as possible and officials here expect consignment by early July—when the crucial period for Bihar starts. Both transactions, officials said, form part of a deal with China for 1,000,000 tons of food grains for which negotiations are being carried on in Peiping.

The Indian Government will shortly resume negotiations with the Soviet Embassy here for 500,000 tons of wheat offered by Moscow in exchange for jute.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman time to yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. COX. The gentleman referred to the animal population of India that eat wheat. They consume 2,000,000 tons a year. In other words, it is known to everyone who knows anything about India that they have 180,000,000 sacred cows; they have 136,000,000 sacred monkeys; they have 10,000,000 sacred or professional beggars—and all these sacred things will have a first claim on any wheat that may be procured by money lent to India. Was the gentleman ever in India? Did he ever see a flock of sacred monkeys come in on a little grain merchant and eat him out of house and home, yet he could not punch one of them out of his grain bin?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I have never been in India, but I may say I am sure Mr. Nehru recognized that situation to which the gentleman refers and that something will have to be done about it.

Mr. COX. They say it is religion and that, therefore, it ought not to be referred to in this debate, but it is a religion that the overburdened taxpayers of this country ought not to be compelled to support.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We must face the question before us on a realistic basis.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, author of bill H. R. 3791, for allowing me to speak at this time. As you know, I am a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The committee met this morning and we go into session again early this afternoon. We are having some very important sessions and are sitting today while we debate this important grain to India issue, I therefore appreciate being allowed to speak at this time.

I thought that in the few minutes allotted to me, I would try to avoid repetition of some of the arguments for the bill that are chiefly based upon costs or dollar value; or alleged economic objections, or the usual line. I thought I would try to call your attention to the fact that there is something in America not less important that we must not lose; I think we have lost too much of it already, for our own safety—the value of an idea; the following of an ideal.

The only way in God's world that you can overcome the idea of communism is with a better idea. The idea of communism has caught or is forced upon people in Asia and elsewhere. Aggressive communism is afloat in the world and is capturing the imagination of the hungry people of the world because most of the people of the world are hungry; their bellies are empty; their children are starving; I fear for my Nation that if in connection with this bill we refuse to stand forthright and righteously upon the premise that America will share that of which she has a superabundance with the people of the starving world, that shall surely lose our own respect as well as destroying chances of winning and holding friends in Asia.

I have here a letter which I shall quote, written from a man in south India. It is an eye-witness account. Here is what Donald F. Ebright wrote on May 4, 1951, from India:

In the villages, where 90 percent of the population lives, people are walking skeletons. Wells and "tanks" or ponds are dry. Prices are soaring. Nothing grows on the parched land, and because of the lack of fodder, large numbers of cattle are dead. Large numbers of men have migrated to the cities in hope of getting employment and food for themselves and their families. Behind them are left sickly children and gaunt wives who cry with hunger. A series of natural calamities exceeding anything seen since 1910, plus the continuing burden of aiding refugees not yet resettled from the terrible uprooting of millions when the subcontinent divided into two in 1947 and 1948, plagues the young Government of India. The Government is doing the best it can with inadequate resources.

It is important that Americans realize that the people of India are doing everything they can for themselves.

Here then is down-to-date eyewitness testimony and evidence of the actual famine condition about which we are speaking. Why then should any Member oppose this bill and ask us to rely on hearsay or rumor or gossip as to the facts? Mr. Ebright was speaking for the Methodist Board of Foreign Missions of America when he wrote the foregoing report which I have read.

The report of our House committee shows that on January 30, 1951, the bipartisan delegation from the Senate and House waited upon the President of the United States and urged him to have help sent to India. In the letter which they wrote the President, from both sides of the political aisle of this House and the Senate, they said:

Unless we act promptly many hundreds of thousands of people of India face starvation.

The unanimous report of the splendid House Foreign Affairs Committee also said:

The evidence presented to the committee at open hearings on H. R. 3017 left no doubt of widespread crop destruction caused by a series of earthquakes, floods, and locust plagues. The committee believes that India's request should be met.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unwilling to rely upon the distinguished bipartisan committee of this Congress in this matter. I cannot subjugate such committee

report and opinion to any partisan or strictly political argument which has been, or will be, or may be made against this bill.

When our American Constitution was written the important consideration and restraints concerned were largely political. Therefore, our own Constitution and the following Bill of Rights were primarily directed toward removing these political restraints. Rights of freedom of speech; freedom of choice of religion; rights to a fair trial—these were some of the rights which were obtained through bloody sacrifices.

Granting that the masses of the people of India do not presently comprehend these political rights we have gained; the starving people of India do comprehend the gnaws of hunger and starvation. They do comprehend from whence their starvation is removed. We can help spank spreading communism by spreading the practice of American idealism.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have an abiding and enduring faith that the American idealism which speaks out for human dignity and for human rights, can be made more than a match for aggressive communism. And, sir, we cannot force this fact to the attention of hundreds of millions of people in a more positive, direct manner, with less expense with no loss of life, as easily and as positively, as we can to furnish them grain to survive upon and let them know it is because we think kindly of them; let them know it is because we want them to live and not die from hunger; let them know that we have a high regard for them because they are human beings; let them know we are not interested in giving them the grain in order to get their millions of dollars of interest on a proposed 2½-percent loan; let them know that America has ideals which it lives by as well as boasts about; let them feel the application of American ideals.

I read history which tells me that the surest way a false idea or ideology can be whipped is to match it with an idea or ideal which has enduring value in the hearts and minds and souls of men. My argument is that the getting of this grain to the starving folks without materialistic gain for ourselves, is a matchless idea; even to starving people. It is matchless and more powerful than powder and bullets. It is applied Americanism.

I know some of you will say that the basis of my reasoning is not sound. You will say it is idealistic. You will say it costs too much money. Well, Mr. Chairman, answer me that way if you will, but applied American idealism, when founded upon the rock of sound, unselfish generosity and charity, always whips greed, selfishness, and petty thinking. No generous thought on impulse is illy founded. Applied American idealism will whip aggressive communism.

We in America need to put perspiration into patriotism. We need to put more inspiration into our democracy. An inspired democracy practicing American ideals will not perish. We need to persevere by the doing of unselfish, sound deeds in keeping with the highest ethical

and religious conceptions of our forefathers and of ourselves. India is a case in point at present. We must put within our own daily consciousness such power of conviction for and on behalf of our highest American ideals that it will make us daily vigilant and vigorous in daily support thereof. Sir, a self-sacrifice and a national sacrifice in behalf of deserving peoples are two of the ideals of American history which we must not forget to practice right now in this very day and circumstance. The destiny of our Nation ultimately will be determined by our applied ideals and ideas far more than by powder and bombs.

I am very conscious of the fact that, being a member of the Un-American Activities Committee and sitting there as I do day after day and oftentimes, even though the House is in session as it is today, that there is forced upon my conscience realization of the fact that we in America need by concrete evidence, if you please, to give convincing proof to the hungry people of India that America is not pinching the eagle on the almighty dollar until it screams and screeches for mercy. The Communists say that is our habit. America's ideals, historically, are not mercenary: India is a present opportunity to practice what we preach. There are millions of people in India who are hungry today. This moment they need relief. They are dying in their tracks on filth. America has a superabundance of grain. This is proof America should share it with the starving people of India or with the starving people of any other part of the world, up to the unselfish ideal limit of our own safety. As a very proud American citizen I am not against a foreign policy of my country which says to the people of the world, that the ideal of the American people is to share and share graciously; to share without our hands behind our backs for reward; to share unselfishly to the maximum of our ability, consistent with our own national economy and national security. The heart of the American people is soundly unselfish and generous. It is part of the American ideal.

I may say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I know of no other idealism in the bosom of my country which at this time would be as powerful as would be the declared policy of my country that it will share unselfishly; that it will save the starving children of India if possible; that it will save the starving mothers of India; and that it will share its superabundance with the starving peoples in the world, consistent with our national security and our national economy. The dollar mark does not beget American idealism. American idealism must whip the idea of communism. From the time of our American Declaration of Independence we have been fighting for the dignity of the individual. This is part of the American ideal. We have been fighting for opportunities for individuals to have an individual consciousness and personality as contradistinguished to the mass consciousness which existed prior to the American Revolution. As I see it, one of the very fundamental concepts of our American way of life as distinguished from aggressive, grasping, militaristic

communism now on the march is that we in America have an ideal that should not make it necessary for us to want something back in return for our every generosity of kind deed. I am not ashamed of the fact I believe in the American gospel which says in substance, that if we "cast our bread upon the waters, it will return in due time well buttered."

Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable talk about our not being able to afford it. I say we cannot afford to not do it. There has been considerable talk about politics. Some have relied, this very hour of debate, on Nehru as an authority as to the famine in India, and in the next breath they have condemned him as being a politician, not to be relied upon. The distinction, to me, between aggressive communism on the march, the communism which has gone on the march to conquer the ideas and ideals of man, is the rival ideal, if you please, not only of the dignity of the individual for which my son and thousands of others have died, but an ideal that we in America possess, which teaches us that it is worth while to do good without thought of reward. If we in America cannot practice that sort of ideal sufficiently enough and graciously enough and unselfishly enough to overcome the idea of aggressive communism, which is based on materialism, then I do not know of any idea or ideal that America does possess which can be as powerful. We must put vigilance and vigor into our American idealism, based upon unselfishness. Communists feed the bellies of these people. When people are hungry they do not stop to think of what is right or wrong. Their hunger naturally conquers their reason. Those who stop their hunger naturally have their good will. Let us practice applied Christianity. Let us prove America's ideas and ideals are not all materialism.

This is not a matter of Nehru or the State Department. This is a heartbeat of American people saying that they demand we save starving women and children. I will say this to you, that if we in this Congress will rise and make this transaction on as generous terms as is humanly possible to them I believe it will do more to captivate not only the imagination, but the understanding of the peoples of the world, than would spending billions of dollars for bullets and power. We presently need to spend both.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for a question.

Mr. JONAS. I want to say this to the gentleman, that I am sure no one will be affected by the splendid emotional appeal he is making, but is this not true that history discloses that every year there is a major famine somewhere throughout the world, and if we follow the gentleman's reasoning we will have to assume not only at the present time, but for generations to come, there will be famines, and that the alleviation of those famines is our responsibility?

Mr. DOYLE. I want to say that we should assume the responsibility of our

American ideals as contradistinguished from the Communist ideals of materialism. One is greed, one is selfishness, one is militarism, and one is to conquer people. You can conquer people through their appetites. This is what communism does.

Mr. JONAS. Well, it is not realistic.

Mr. DOYLE. It is realistic. It is the American way. We must follow it to win out.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, there have been some suggestions made, I do not know how seriously, that we do not have sufficient food reserves in the country to enable us to export the maximum quantity of food which would be called for under this proposal. I do not believe that there is any basis for a contention of that kind and I would like to briefly point out what our situation is with respect to grain and other food that might be exported under this legislation.

There has been a considerable amount of talk about a poor wheat crop this year and we are going to have the smallest crop that we have had for a number of years. It may be less than 1,000,000,000 bushels, but not very much less, according to the latest estimates. Most of us have gotten so used to billion-bushel wheat crops that we forget we had but one billion-bushel wheat crop in this country until 1944. Since that time we have had several, and it is fortunate that we have because we have not only been able to supply needed food to other nations and take care of our own needs, but we have been able to build up a sizable reserve. The carry-over of wheat on July 1, according to the best available estimates, will be about 423,000,000,000 bushels. That, added to a crop of approximately 1,000,000,000 bushels this year means a supply for the 1951-52 marketing year of 1,400,000,000 bushels. Of course, wheat is only one of the commodities that will be exported under this legislation. It probably will not comprise more than two-thirds of the total; perhaps not that much. There will be grain sorghums, as another important element, a commodity of which we have a large supply. This year there will be planted, perhaps, the largest acreage of grain sorghums that we have ever known in this country. A great deal of the wheat acreage which has been lost by winter kill and other causes in the Southwest will be planted in grain sorghums this year, and there is no reason, so far as I can see, why we cannot send, if necessary, four or five hundred thousand tons of grain sorghums to India.

Other commodities that are mentioned—corn, beans, and rice—are in good supply so that there can be no question, I am sure, but that we have whatever food may be necessary to send under this legislation.

While we are on the subject of food, I want to point out how very fortunate we are in this country as far as our food supply is concerned. If we compare the figures now with our production before World War II, we find that our annual

production of food in this country is about 42 percent above what it was preceding World War II. The consumption of food on the part of our people has increased above any figure which it was before the beginning of World War II, and it is estimated that for 1951 it will be 13 percent per capita above any pre-war year.

This food is not only greater in quantity, it is greater in quality in that it consists more largely of the protective foods, the proteins, meat, eggs, dairy products, and fresh fruits and vegetables.

A stranger from Mars, if he came to this country, or a visitor from India or any other country where food is scarce, could not help but be astounded by the talk he would hear on the question of food. He would be amazed to find that at least two-thirds of the adult people in this country are watching the scales every day to see how much they have lost or gained. If there is any one personal problem the American people are interested in today it is their weight. I understand the most popular feature article that has appeared in American newspapers in recent months has been this Fat Boy Elmer diet story that people are reading because they are interested in reducing their weight. Of course the reason they are overweight is that they are eating too much food.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think the standard of living is too high in this country?

Mr. HOPE. I am not saying the standard of living is too high, I am saying that in this country instead of suffering from underconsumption of food there are millions of people who at least think that they are suffering from overconsumption of the abundant food supply we have in this country.

Contrast that with the situation in a country like India. I do not know the extent of the starvation in India. There are different figures on that. But I am sure there are going to be millions of people in India who will starve if that country is not able to procure additional food, and there is no place they can get any substantial quantity of it except in the United States of America. We take food for granted in this country. Some countries have taken famines for granted. But that is no longer true to the extent it has been in the past. I do not think there is a country in the world today where the people are not demanding that their government, whatever kind of government they have, make every possible effort to secure for them an adequate supply of food. We all know in the restless atmosphere which prevails in many countries in the world today that any failure on the part of a government to make the maximum effort to secure food for its people is the greatest possible inducement to accept a political philosophy like communism. Such people are even more likely to fall prey to Communist agitation when they contrast their misery with the lush supply of food in countries like our own. We cannot furnish food enough from

our supplies to take care of all the world's hunger, but I think we owe it to ourselves and the world to make available our surpluses to areas where actual starvation is taking place. I believe any steps we take under this legislation to supply to India additional supplies of food will pay dividends, in that it will prevent the trend toward communism which exists in every ill-fed and undernourished country in the world today.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that under the provisions of the bill now before the Committee, and which the Committee is considering, there is no provision made for the shipping of one kernel of wheat or any other sort of grain to India? Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman understands that the legislation authorizes the shipping of food to India and authorizes the extension of credit for that purpose.

Mr. COX. With great respect, I must say the gentleman is mistaken as to what the bill says. The bill proposes to lend India \$190,000,000, which \$190,000,000 India can spend with Russia or with Communist China as she sees fit.

Mr. HOPE. She can spend it for food which is vitally needed; yes. And as I have already stated the only place in the world today from which any considerable quantity of surplus food can be procured is the United States. I have discussed the economic and political aspects of this matter. There is a humanitarian side also. We are a Christian Nation. Our people have deep sympathy for those in distress wherever they may be. Since the end of World War II American farmers alone have contributed millions of bushels of grain and other food supplies to hungry people all over the world. Millions of other Americans have made their contributions of food and clothing through churches and philanthropic organizations.

The situation in India is too big a problem for private efforts but I am sure that the American people as a whole are keenly interested in this legislation and in having our Government make food supplies available to the people of India. I have received many letters, the contents of which indicated they were written from the hearts of good Christian people urging that Congress do everything possible to meet this need. Many of them would like to send it as a gift. The Government of India has not asked it as a gift. All that has been requested is special and easy terms of payment. That is all that this bill provides. Under the circumstances passage of this legislation without crippling amendments is the least we can do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, there is one question at this moment that I would like to try to clear up, and that is the question of India's ability to repay this loan.

As I understand it, there is no question of India's ability to service a loan of the size authorized by the bill. India's excess of reserves over requirements is around \$500,000,000. The burden of this loan might reduce the amount available for her total development program, but that is not definite, either. She is already exporting all the commodities which her mines and industries can produce at this time without greater additional outlay of capital. The bulk of these commodities comes to the United States and the free world.

This age is dominated by force, ideas of force, and subversion—the army of communism versus the army of the free world. To one or the other of these the whole world must turn. Nations may want to remain neutral, but history is shaping the need for decisions, and the United States must help these nations decide. It is with this global background of force that I believe we must consider this bill, H. R. 3791. It has a very historical setting.

As my colleagues pointed out yesterday, this is the first time that this new nation has asked for assistance of the Congress and the people of the United States. Our actions and deliberations on this bill will not only be heard and felt in India but will be heard and felt all over Asia.

Our concern in considering this measure is not primarily how the emergency arose, but how we can assist in meeting this emergency swiftly and effectively now that we have been asked for assistance. Personally I feel that this vital issue is not the question of the relationship of Pakistan and India, not the political, diplomatic position taken by the Indian Government, not the price of jute nor the barter of minerals, not the problem of sterling balances. The vital issue is how we can help our fellow men, the Indian people. We have the opportunity, a long overdue response to the people of a new nation, India.

I personally joined a group of sponsors to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India on a grant basis. I felt that the objective deserved this support, but since this method was not acceptable to many, I support the method outlined in H. R. 3791 to furnish food grains on a loan basis in accordance with ECA lending facilities.

Through our ECA program, Russia failed in the West and then turned to the East. The aim of Russia is to widen the gap between the East and the West. It is her new method in dividing and absorbing the nations of the world.

India turned to the West for assistance. Now is our chance to assist this new independent Nation as we were aided in the early days of our Republic, when we severed our relationship with the same mother country, England.

It is this infant republic we are asked to help, whose constitution is modeled after that of the United States Constitution, and it contains a similar bill of rights. Fundamentally, our form of government and our way of life are her ideal. India needs our help in this critical period or assistance would not have been requested. Her need is known to be positive.

Indians are a proud people and a suspicious people, particularly suspicious of Europeans, in whose class Americans are placed. The basis for this sentiment may be partly a result of the English colonization period. I fear that is the real feeling in the world today, and this is our opportunity to check their fears in that the United States has no thought of aggression and no desire for exploitation.

Most of us agree on the humanitarian aspect, particularly since we have a surplus of grain; but as practical-minded Americans, there is another side. It is practical and it is good business. To me it has an intrinsic, political aspect, which I am going to explain.

This aid is necessary for world peace and for the general welfare of the United States in order that this new independent republic shall remain a free nation. It is consistent with the foreign policy of the United States in order to create situations of strength for new independent nations, and to permit them to work out their own internal problems by democratic processes, as the United States did during the early days of our Republic. But, to me, more important than any other situation is the fact that India is geographically important to the free world, due to the fact that if India is absorbed into the orbit of Russia, it would accrue to the benefit of Russia alone, to the detriment of the free world, and particularly to the United States.

It would cut off our vital raw-material-supply lines. As you and I know today, the United States lifelines for vital raw material, reach to every segment of the globe, and at the very doorstep of India for the tin, manganese, rubber, and other strategic materials that keep industry and the arms program at top speed.

Any unfriendly nations able to sever shipping routes in this area, to control India, would place the United States and the free world in jeopardy.

It was only recently, last week, that I really realized that almost all of our strategic material that are necessary for these supplies are imported by the United States.

Crude rubber must come from outside the United States. The supplies come from Malaya, Indonesia, and Thailand.

Chrome ore needed for making alloy steel is produced in this country in small quantities. Russia formerly furnished this material. Our supply now comes from Turkey, the Philippines, and South Africa.

Tin is imported from Malaya, Bolivia, and Indonesia.

Manganese is a metal for which no adequate substitute has been found in making steel. More than 93 percent is imported from the Gold Coast of Africa and from India.

India shipped to the United States in 1950, 585,971 tons of manganese, three-quarters of its total exports. The bulk of the remainder went to the United Kingdom. There is a current rumor that there has been a cut in manganese shipments in 1951. This is not true. From January 1 to March 3, 110,000 long tons have been shipped to the United States. This is a rate about 10 percent greater than the average of

1950. Arrivals in February alone to one company in the United States were 16,000 tons.

To review briefly the foreign trade of India, I want to emphasize the fact that India imports from the United States amounted to \$230,000,000, while the exports to the United States were valued at \$192,000,000.

Mica: Indian exports of mica in 1950 to all countries totaled 340,000 hundredweight. Of this total the United States took 80 percent and of this 37 percent went to the United States stockpile.

Jute: The jute industry has in past years accounted for more than a third of India's total foreign exchange earnings, and almost three-fifths of its dollar earnings. The United States is the leading importer of Indian jute manufactures. There is one point I want to make at this time and that is that India has no trade with the Soviet Union in strategic materials and has had none since 1946. I believe, no matter how we feel on this bill, that the importance of keeping these routes open for our strategic supplies is most essential to the national security of the United States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. COX. The gentlewoman made the observation that this was the first time India has ever come to the United States for aid. Is the gentlewoman aware of the fact that on two of the lots of wheat that we let her have during the present year we took a considerable loss on one which she got at the world price rather than at the domestic price?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I do.

Mr. COX. And that on the other we gave her a reduction of \$9,000,000 in the price?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I realize that. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that he is in error. The commodity in question was not wheat but milo. In late May and early June 1950, the Commodity Credit Corporation was ready and anxious to sell to India some milo which we had and which was in danger of spoiling. We sold the milo at \$1.80 per hundredweight—a little bit below the going export price. It would have spoiled had we not sold it. By selling it to India, we got cash. Had we not sold it, we would have lost the 200,000 tons.

A few months later we made another sale of milo to India at \$1.40 per hundredweight. We did absorb some of this cost. The gentleman is again in error. The cost we absorbed was about \$6,600,000, not \$9,000,000 as the gentleman says. We did this under section 32 of Public Law 320, the agriculture laws of which the gentleman is an ardent supporter.

Our sacrifices for peace in the world transcend the reasons for arguments against the passage of this bill. Either we must extend the hand of friendship to India in her need or cast her to the forces of evil and destruction—the army of communism.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a considerable amount of enlightening debate on this subject and we will hear more. I shall endeavor in the time that has been yielded to me to answer the major arguments which have been made with respect to this legislation.

First, let me state briefly why I believe this legislation must be passed in the national security interest of the United States. We are dealing here with 350,000,000 people in South Asia out of a total of roughly 700,000,000 people who are left in the list of the free peoples in that area of the world.

The new Republic of India came into being only on January 26, 1950, having received its independent status in August of 1947. The subcontinent of India is the fulcrum of Asia, a state that is directly on the border of China, and, therefore, certainly influenced by the fact that communism has triumphed in China and that China has a rampant army of something in the neighborhood of two to four million men. For the relief of distress in India we are asked to make an investment, asked to make a loan to this Nation, to this government which has not defaulted on any of its external debts, a loan to relieve an urgent famine situation.

There is some argument that we should turn our back on this nation and run the risk of jeopardizing the one remaining really big anchor that the free peoples have in Asia. It seems almost inconceivable that that argument can be made in the face of the evidence before us. Why is it made? First, it is said that India is not our declared ally against the Soviet bloc; second, that the famine is really not serious; and third, that we should get strategic materials from India.

It is perfectly clear that the people of India are a free people today, and if any evidence of that is required, it is shown by many facts. For example, 43 deputies of the India's Parliament had perfect freedom to send a communication by cable to the Congress of the United States about this very food-aid bill. The only thing that Mr. Nehru could do about it was to lecture them on the fact that that was not the way to run a government; in other words, that India could not conduct her affairs by having individual representatives of what is tantamount to their Congress communicate with another sovereign power.

Secondly, this Dr. Kumarrapa, whose speech has been read here in part and referred to several times, I think his actions and statements prove that India is a very free country. The Government of India said that Dr. Kumarrapa had a perfect right to state his own position as a lecturer in the United States in his private capacity. This is the official statement dated March 9, 1951:

He is authorized to speak for the Government of India only in the social commission of the United Nations to which he is a delegate on subjects coming up before that commission in accordance with the Government's instructions.

Then they add:

Any views expressed by him on topics outside the commission or on topics other than those before it are his own, and the Government has no responsibility for them.

He was completely repudiated, and everything he said was completely repudiated by the Government of India, but he was not jailed for saying it.

Let us see about India's record in the United Nations. Despite the fact she is sitting on the doorstep of Communist China, it is my recollection she did join originally in one of the key votes when the question of sending U. N. forces in to repel aggression in Korea was concerned. Away back in June she joined I recall, with other United Nations powers in asking that action be taken to stop aggression in Korea. Since that time it is a fact that she has abstained in the United Nations in respect of condemning the aggression of the Communist Chinese and a declaration of an embargo on shipping war materials to Communist China. There is no condoning that. It is our mission to try to win India over to our side, not 33 percent as demonstrated by the three votes I have described, but by 100 percent.

Now, what is the way to win her over? To hit her over the head or to let millions of her people starve to death? Or shall we win her over on the relatively cheap basis of giving her this essential food aid? The answer is self evident.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. It occurs to me that most of the arguments today have involved the relationship between the United States Government and the new Government of India. I wonder if the gentleman will explain, so that not only the Congress but the people of the country will understand, just how will the starving people of India, not the Government of India, but the starving people of India, get the grain we want to provide by this bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I will be glad to answer the gentleman if he will permit me to proceed for a minute on this point. I will go right to the next point which involves the claim that the famine is not real in India.

The key to India, the key to Nehru, and the key to everything we face is found in the May 1st speech that my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin referred to. In the next to the last sentence of that speech this is what Nehru said, and I want you to remember that he is elected by the people, he is a politician like anyone else who has to be elected. He said:

I want you above all to drink of common mother India, whose children we are, of her honor and self-respect and of her distress in the agony of many of her children. Let us put all our resources, all our strength and energy in this war against famine which we must and will win.

He was expressing pride in his nation and pride in his people.

Mr. Chairman, he made that speech on May 1. The Foreign Affairs Committee had reported out an aid to India

bill in March. There it was the 1st of May. India was facing a famine situation. No action had been taken in the Congress of the United States, either by the House of Representatives or by the Senate. What did you expect Mr. Nehru to say to the people of India? Should he have said to his people you have the liberty to starve? Or did you expect him to make a speech castigating the United States? Or did you expect him to say what he did say: "All right, my dear people, we are facing famine; the best we can do is to depend upon ourselves."

I ask you as reasonable men, what did you want him to say on May 1 in face of complete failure of action on the part of the Congress of the United States? We are disturbed, and rightfully, that Nehru made a fuss over the fact that the Russians had shipped only 50,000 tons of grain into India, on barter, whereas we had shipped hundreds of thousands of tons India bought here. But should we not ask ourselves if perhaps we ourselves invited that very action by the delay on this bill. What else did we expect? Did you expect anything other than implied criticism of our own delays, if delay was wrong? If we feel delay was not wrong, let us not be surprised. Let us be adults and accept the consequences.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How much excess grain have we in this country now?

Mr. JAVITS. The distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPKINS] just made a speech a few moments ago in which he said that we are fully able to meet the requirements of this particular bill insofar as grain—grain sorghums, milo, and wheat are concerned.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Some reference has been made as to exactly how this grain will be distributed. It will be distributed through the Indian ration system, will it not?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. May I point out to my distinguished colleague from Ohio that we went to the trouble of calling in the United States agricultural attaché in India, Clifford C. Taylor. We were tremendously impressed with him. Mr. Taylor advised us that the rationing system in India was excellent and he proved it in the following way, and this appears at page 37 of the hearings. He said that at one time just to test their rationing system India took off rationing in 1947, thinking if there were any hoarded stocks they would come out in an open market. Nothing more came out. Apparently the rationing system was so good that it was reaching all of the available stocks in the country.

As to distribution within the country, Mr. Taylor testified that he had checked the distribution system in the areas of the country in which it functioned. It covers either in full or in part 125,000,000 people. He was able to vouch to us for the fact that was equitable distribution

and that it did fully the job we had a right to expect and that the people would get the grain.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the starving people of India be forced to buy this grain or will it be given to them by the Government of India?

Mr. JAVITS. The people of India will buy the grain with money which they either have, because they earn it, or on the basis of work-relief projects which are initiated in India to see that they get the money with which to buy the grain; indigents—and we have had full discussion on that score—are cared for by free grain distribution through governmental channels in refugee camps. In rural areas indigent people are, through long-accepted custom, supported by their own family group, which in turn participates in the rationing system.

In this case we have a loan. And as to what happens to the money the people pay, we hope India will have money enough to make its payments on time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The money that is received by the Indian Government on the sale of this grain or food in India is then put in a joint account, and it is called counterpart funds.

Mr. JAVITS. Not now. This is a straight loan proposition.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman, of course, has no understanding of the provisions of the bill, as you would judge from that statement; is that not correct?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry.

Mr. COX. But he is wrong; is he not?

Mr. JAVITS. On that particular counterpart point.

Mr. FULTON. That was in the previous bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is interested in getting food to the hungry people of India or to the people who will become hungry.

Mr. JAVITS. I am interested in relieving the famine situation in India.

Mr. COX. If that is the purpose of the gentleman, why did he not provide, or see that it was provided for in the bill that he is now supporting, that the wheat or the grain or the food that India may need she should obtain from the United States, purchasing it with this \$190,000,000?

Mr. JAVITS. As far as the \$190,000,000 is concerned, we can rely upon the arrangements between the ECA and the Indian Government to take care of the purchase of as much food grains as America can possibly sell. May I say this, too, there is food grain in essence available primarily only in the United States. The questions the gentleman asks are quite impractical. The grain

surplus is here. The people of India have themselves scratched the bottom of the barrel in Canada, Argentina, Australia, and New Zealand and other areas for grain supply. The only thing the gentleman is thinking about is that they will put this money in their jeans and go into the Soviet Union and give them dollars for grain. Now, that is assuming that there is a surplus of grain in the Soviet Union that they want to sell, but I think we can certainly depend on the Economic Cooperation Administration, run by Bill Foster, to see that no such thing takes place.

Mr. COX. But under the provisions of the gentleman's bill India could spend every dime of this \$190,000,000 in purchasing food from Russia.

Mr. JAVITS. Under the provisions of the bill, according to the gentleman, India could use the money for pate de foie gras and truffles. The gentleman is talking about complete impracticalities.

Mr. COX. The gentleman favors the adoption of this bill. Does he expect this to be the only case of this nature that Congress will be called upon to handle?

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly do not, neither does the gentleman or anyone else. The President has already told us that he is bringing in an eight-and-one-half to nine-billion-dollar economic aid bill. May I ask the gentleman this: Does the gentleman want to spend every dollar that is spent to win this struggle against communism with inert and deadly weapons, or does he want to try to win over communism with life-giving goods—with grain as we try to do here?

Mr. COX. I want to end the ECA program that has cost us so much already.

Mr. JAVITS. I want to end the struggle against communism with the decisive defeat of communism, and if that is the difference between the gentleman and I, then I will stand on my position.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman permit me to propound one more question?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman from Georgia raised the question with the gentleman from New York that he raised with the gentleman from Missouri. At that time I stated for the benefit of the House, and I would like to reiterate that the committee will offer an amendment to clarify any doubt about the money that will come from this loan, to be used first to buy available grain in the United States of America, so that there will be no question about that.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I should like to propound two questions to the gentleman from New York. First, I may have a misconception of Mr. Nehru's statement of May 1. As I understood his speech, what he said was this: He was appealing to the Indian people to go into the far corners and bring out all the grain and all the foodstuffs they had. The impression I got from his speech was that he

feels they can take care of themselves. The implication is all through it.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me answer that question, and then we will go on to the next one.

I just pointed out that the frame of reference in which he was saying this was the frame of reference that he had no right to except any help from the United States or anybody else up to that point. And may I point out another thing. The Indian people were getting 9 ounces of grain by way of ration distribution. They have as a matter of life and death to raise it to 12. They still cannot make it. Nine ounces of grain means 900 calories a day. Twelve ounces means 1,200 calories a day. They have alleged that they are going to do it, but they cannot make it. Does not that disprove the idea the gentleman has that some way or other they have scraped up 2,000,000 tons of grain from the corners?

Mr. BURLESON. It is suggested to me that we know more about their conditions than Mr. Nehru knows.

Mr. JAVITS. That is not so, because the Indian Government wants this grain aid urgently. It is continuing to want it up to this very day, and that is known to all who read and listen. It wants it because it must have it to avert famine. Recent food riots in India should certainly be convincing enough on that point.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS].

INDIVIDUAL HELP FOR INDIVIDUALS IN INDIA

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, the strength of this country is that we have been individual people working under a Government which recognizes and protects and gives dignity to us as individuals. We must keep it that way. But we cannot any longer blindly close our eyes to the fact that even our complex society has reached proportions where individual and voluntary corporal acts of mercy are inadequate. We came reluctantly to the recognition during the depression years of the early thirties that we could not let people in this country starve because the burden on individual charity was too great. It was a very hard decision for many to make, but I suppose there is no one conversant with these facts who now would say that we could have come through these devastating years depending on private charity or individual effort to take care of the hungry people of this great country.

I can still feel the accusing eyes of hungry people in the soup lines at the Salvation Army headquarters and other private charities. I still have a sickening nausea when there comes recollection of those families under the bridge abutments cooking in discarded cans whatever scraps of food they could find over fires of driftwood. Then came Government aid. It was a new venture. It was not well organized at first, but through Government, not individual, action it saved the lives and self-respect of the individual. We are at that position now with India. Members have said our contribution should be individual—if

this effort is to be classified as charity. I agree that the instance of the Good Samaritan on the road to Jericho is the ideal—it is being followed today by thousands of sturdy citizens throughout this country who have a concern for these starving people of India. In my own State of Ohio, headed last year by Mr. Frank Farnsworth, a stalwart citizen of the district I have the honor to represent, the crop organization collected from the farmers of Ohio and shipped to the needy people of the world about a hundred carloads of food grain. The individuals in this fine organization, realizing their inability to meet the vast need in India, are urging Congress to pass this bill to send grain to India.

We should frankly face the facts as to what this bill is and what it is not. It is not a club to force the Republic of India to change its laws with reference to its embargo on monazite sands. Under similar circumstances, I believe Americans would be willing to starve before we would let any other nation take advantage of our extreme misery to cause us to violate our principles.

It is not a bribe to get India to take sides with the United States or the United Nations. Of course, we hope and expect that—but loyal friendships are not bought and trusted allies are not bribed—these relationships are earned.

It is not a bankable loan in the sense that we can expect to foreclose on this new republic and its people if it is not paid according to its terms. But it is first a cup of cold water and a loaf of bread to a very hungry and needy neighbor. A neighbor whose conduct we have not approved of as measured by our standard. We do not like some of their associates. We sometimes feel that they should come half way around the world for their pals and forget about those who live in the same neighborhood with them. Some of us do not even like their pets. But as sure as there is a God who controls our destiny the only way these 350,000,000 people of India can be brought to join with us in a program of good will in the world is to demonstrate that we have some love and good will in our own hearts.

Second, it is an opportunity to establish a bridgehead of friendship to a nation of 350,000,000 people who have great world possibilities. Just now we complain of their habits and practices and defense mechanisms. But remember the Republic of India is less than 6 years old. Let us look at the Turkish nation and people—how far they have come in the past 25 years. Given time, friendship, and encouragement India can even exceed the record of Turkey, Japan, or any other Asiatic country in learning the art of making available for its people the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If the food provided by this bill can help do that every cent is well invested.

The missionaries went into India from a desire from within themselves to help these people. They created a great residue of love and respect among the people of India for America—although covered up with a lot of debris of unfortunate statements by thoughtless public figures in both countries.

Then the American businessman went to India with a desire from without to make money and to extend the benefits of American enterprise to that land.

The opportunity now exists through this food grain to show the people of India that all of America has a concern for them as individuals. We are not trying to change their religion or their form of government. We are not trying to exploit their resources. We are just being the kind of neighbor who deserves their respect and confidence.

This is the only approach which justifies the passage of this bill. It is the only approach which is good business as well as good neighborliness. It is not the act of the shyster who wants to get his fee while the tears are hot but of the lawyer who wants to help to build for his client a fine business in which both can have continued pleasure and profit. It is the approach of the friend and neighbor who expects to live cooperatively alongside another in a very small world for a very long time.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to know how much wheat we have in this country that is available for India or anyone else.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The Department of Agriculture advises we have around 450,000,000 bushels. This bill provides for 2,000,000 tons, or about 80,000,000 bushels. The Department of Agriculture says we have sufficient but not a surplus of wheat. They also say that the winter wheat has been reduced through a disease called mosaic, by 25 percent.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I am concerned about the Government going in on price controls when we have a surplus of things. Is there any reason in the world why we should have price controls on a commodity of which there is a surplus?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Naturally, when you send things abroad, that makes the price of the article higher, because that creates, if not a scarcity, a less amount available with increased costs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday I said when I first heard about this grant-to-India bill, I was in favor of it because I thought it was going to be a mutual proposition; that the United States had grain which India needed and that they had strategic materials, monozite sand, jute, magnesium, and things that are necessary to the defense of this country. But, as I stated yesterday, even though Mr. Nehru did not ask for any gift, the State Department came in and said, "Regardless, we want to give it you anyway."

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I also asked certain questions. I asked those questions of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee particularly, and they have gone unanswered—every one of them. I said, "If we do give this grain

to India, will the Indian Government trade us strategic material for it, which we need badly?"

There has been no answer to that question.

Another question I asked the Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday was this: "Will the Indian Government, if we give them this grain, agree to fight communism?"

There has not been one member of the Foreign Affairs Committee who answered that question.

Another question I asked yesterday: "If we give them this grain, will the Indian Government furnish troops alongside of our boys who are being slaughtered, 7,000 miles away, on foreign shores?" Yes, American young men who are fighting practically alone.

There has been no discussion or explanation of that by any member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Another question I asked: "Will the Indian Government, if we give them this grain, vote with the United States occasionally before the United Nations?" So far to my knowledge they have voted against the United States every time.

There has been no answer to that.

Then, above all, I said: "In the event that the United States gives the Indian Government this grain, will Nehru stop applauding Russia?" You know he opened the Indian Parliament a week or so ago praising Russia but did not say one good word about the United States.

There has been no answer to any of these questions.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not now.

Mr. FULTON. Not even for an answer from a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to your questions?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will yield later; not at this point. All that has been discussed in this discussion—and that includes the remarks by our beloved Speaker also—is that this is the human thing to do; that the people of India are suffering. That has been the whole argument of those who favor this proposition. There has been no other reason given except the people of India are suffering.

That is true of a billion and a half people throughout the world; they are also undernourished. I say to you the surest way to make an enemy out of any country is to give one nation and refuse to give other nations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not just now. I will yield later.

I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that there are hundreds of millions of people throughout Israel, Egypt, and other such places who are starving. I venture to say there are millions of Americans who are undernourished at the present time. I would say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that undoubtedly if he will go home to his district he will find thousands right in his own district who are undernourished. One of the things I cannot understand is that there are so many Americans in high official life who, I am sure, spend more time attempting

to solve the plight of people living outside the United States than they do in solving our problems here at home.

So it comes down to the question: Why should we help them when they will not help us?

In regard to the remarks of the Speaker, whom we all love and respect, he said if we do not give this to India we will be offending them. Offending them—think of that. Are they not offending us when they refuse to go along with us in this war against communism and aggression? Why are we sending our boys throughout the world to be slaughtered? We are fighting aggression and we are fighting communism.

Has India by any kind of action indicated that they are helping us in our grave hour? Of course not. Our Government is spending billions of dollars. We are a nation with a national debt of \$258,000,000,000 and committed to another \$100,000,000,000. Our Ways and Means Committee is seeking ways and means to bring in more money. This year we are spending \$55,000,000,000 and still running in the red many billions. Next year it is proposed that we spend \$100,000,000,000 and we will go in the red again next year \$35,000,000,000 and the year after another \$35,000,000,000. Notwithstanding that we are raising our taxes, it will still leave a large part of it for our children, our grandchildren, and future generations to pay. Still people insist that we give and give and give.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] if he would construe the adoption of this bill to mean that Congress was committing itself to give like treatment to a dozen other nations now sitting on the steps of the Capitol?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is a good question.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman agrees with me that the adoption of this bill will mean a vote of confidence in Dean Acheson, and it will be committing this Congress to the support of the Javits plan which will call for about \$7,000,000,000 in addition to that already pledged?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that that is a very splendid statement, and I am sorry that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is not present to give answer.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am sorry; I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. Chairman, when we start talking about giving away \$190,000,000 to buy this wheat, it means it will require the payment of 800,000 income-tax payers of the United States who are paying \$20 per month or \$240 income tax this year. As I say, the Ways and Means Committee is working day and night to try to raise money to meet our needs. They even seriously considered a tax of 20 percent on lollipops, bubble gum, and all candies. Still we come in here now and want to give all this money to a nation

that has been against us and still refuses to cooperate with us.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked me to yield. I now ask him this question: How are we being benefited directly or indirectly by passing this bill except the satisfaction of relieving starvation in one nation against dozens of other nations whom we also want as our friends?

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman asks me if the United States of America is being benefited?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes; except for the satisfaction of having relieved suffering in one nation when there are 20 others appealing for like aid?

Mr. FULTON. The United States of America is being benefited because we are getting an ally that will stand by us if we maintain our high principles, in the event of trouble and world war III. India supplied 2,250,000 troops to the Allies in World War II, had 106,000 casualties, and had 36,000 men killed. Right alongside of our own men in Italy they fought, too.

Mr. COX. Ask the gentleman how many troops they have in Korea.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Here is a question for the gentleman, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee: Does he not think the Government of India should give us strategic materials which we need and which will go to Russia unless we do get them?

Mr. FULTON. I certainly do believe India has cooperated and will cooperate in this respect. We are friendly peoples at this time—let us not alienate good friends.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think that the Government of India should fight communism?

Mr. FULTON. The Government of India is fighting communism right at home, and everybody admits it is doing a good job. Nobody even questions that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania think the Government of India should furnish troops to fight alongside with our boys being slaughtered 7,000 miles away?

Mr. COX. Will my friend permit the gentleman from Pennsylvania to say how many soldiers India has in Korea now?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. None.

Does not the gentleman think that the Government of India should vote occasionally with us in the United Nations?

Does not the gentleman think the Government should compliment us once in a while rather than applaud Russia any time Russia does some insignificant thing like when Russia sold 50,000 tons of wheat to India?

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated unless the government of India trades us strategic material for the grain. Unless India in no uncertain terms agrees to fight communism and communistic aggression; unless India agrees to furnish troops to help our boys in Korea; unless India agrees to vote with peace-loving nations in the United Nations; unless Prime Minister Nehru and other high officials of the Indian Government do not stop applauding the words and actions of the communistic government of Russia.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice to those of my colleagues who have spoken in support of H. R. 3791, a bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India.

The program contemplated by this bill represents statesmanship of the highest order. Furthermore, it is consistent with the history and the record of generous help with which the people of the United States have on many occasions responded to the needs of unfortunates in foreign lands. The bill before us proposes a measure which is in keeping with the highest and finest traditions of our Republic.

From the testimony which has been heard in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and public opinion as expressed in the press, over the radio, in public forums, and in messages which we have all received from citizens in all parts of the country, it is clear that this bill has the solid support of the people of the United States.

While this response is spontaneous and is founded on the unflinching humanitarian instinct of the American people and their deep friendship for the people of India, it is at the same time based on a realistic approach to the problem of foreign affairs. The Republic of India is a new free nation which gained its independence from colonialism less than 4 years ago following a long period of storm and stress. On January 26, 1950, India was established, under a representative government, as the democratic Republic of India. It is the second most populous nation in the world, with its 350,000,000 people living in an area of a million square miles. Ahead there lies a great future for this young republic, provided that we can demonstrate our friendship when the friendship of the free world is so important to her survival. India is striving for a world of peace and freedom, a world in which its people and all other people may develop their own political, social, and economic institutions. The people and the leaders of India have chosen for their country and for themselves the institutions of democracy. Today the people of India stand between the traditions of our western civilization, on which their institutions are founded, and the ruthless propaganda of imperialist Soviet communism. Hungry Indians, with no food relief to look forward to, are not concerned with ideologies. If we should fail them and the U. S. S. R. should feed them, we will, in effect, have thrust them into the waiting arms of imperialistic communism. This we must avoid, for if we fail India, we fail the teeming millions of Asia who also are looking to us for guidance. The enactment of this bill will serve as a symbol of encouragement and hope to all those people.

I believe that these are fundamentals which the people of the United States clearly recognize. Their first instinct is, of course, humanitarian, but let us not imagine for one moment that they are not as much concerned with the general welfare and security of the United States as is the Congress itself. They know full

well that if a starving India should fall prey to the forces of communism, it will seriously threaten the security of the vital interests of the United States in the Far East.

If India is to win her race against starvation, we must act with speed. The target date originally set for the beginning of shipments was April 1, almost 2 months ago. Conditions in India have been getting much worse than expected. Food riots have broken out, and in some areas the government rationing system has temporarily collapsed. The situation is truly desperate. We cannot, we must not, delay any longer.

President Truman pointed out in his special message to the Congress asking for authorization to send relief to India, and I quote:

It is not our objective in foreign affairs to dominate other nations. Our objective is to strengthen the free nations through cooperation—free and voluntary cooperation based on a common devotion to freedom.

This bill eminently fits into that pattern of our foreign policy, the high traditions of the American people, and the wisdom and foresight of the Congress.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I approach a final decision on the matter of emergency grain for India with considerable trepidation and some misgivings.

If time would permit, and I were inclined to do so, I could offer some five or six reasons why I oppose this legislation. But when I consider it from a humanitarian standpoint, and realizing that America has to have friends today, I come to the conclusion that its benefits outweigh any objection I might have.

In arriving at my decision I am thinking along the same line that the majority of my colleagues in the House are thinking in their decision to support this legislation, and in after months, when I am asked by my constituents as to why I voted as I propose to vote today, I will offer the same explanation as the man did who was brought before the magistrate and charged with throwing a brick through a plate-glass window. The magistrate said, "Sam, why did you do it?" Sam said, "Your Honor, at the time I thought it was the proper thing to do."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the original group who became aware of what the probable famine that would come to India as a result of floods and droughts and the youth of her government. As it happened, I had had a good many contacts with Indians for many years. I have friends in India. Some of them are nurses who have been to this country to our schools of nursing; others of them are doctors who have institutions in India. Others are members of various interesting groups.

The first Ambassador from India had a most charming wife, Madam Rama Rau who did much during their tour of duty in the new Embassy to win friends for India. I heard her speak in Cleveland about the conditions in which the

great mass of the people lived, the miracle that the Indian women were trying to do. She had much to say of their appreciation of the generosity of Americans. Among other things, she told of what it meant to the Indian people to have the ambulances and the mobile hospital units that had been sent over. So much could be accomplished, so much could be done that was impossible without them, and in addition, they were the visible evidence that the people of America wanted to help them, to give them hope and courage as well as health. But then she hesitated and said:

Ladies, there is one thing I think you do not understand and that is the stark reality of the poverty of the Indian people. Much as we need this help you have so generously sent, grateful as we are for this practical evidence of your desire to make these health units available to us, we have to find the money to run them and sometimes it is a very difficult matter.

We realized suddenly that we should have known, should have realized that in a new country so vast as India, poverty is on every hand and that a maintenance fund should have accompanied the gift.

Mr. Chairman, the longer I live and the more I have to do with those great countries on the other side of the earth the more I realize that the Western World has not as yet any real comprehension of the problems and the complexities confronting those new-born nations. It has been my privilege to know some of the men and women of India, to study some of their ancient wisdom, to help in a very small way to build better health conditions here and there. I have the greatest possible admiration for the courage with which they are attacking the almost fantastic problems facing them.

When I learned of the droughts and the floods that had overtaken great sections of the country I was glad to join with the small group of Senators and Congressmen who went to the President and asked that something be done about it.

It had not occurred to us to do anything except make it all a gift out of our plenty toward their need. To me there was an added reason to make it a grant as we had done in Europe so that counterpart funds would be set up, and with those funds India could improve agricultural methods materially.

Into the midst of that particular moment of my thinking came my distinguished colleague LARRY SMITH with the story of two plows brought over from India literally in the hands of two of his friends. One was the very oldest of plows—all wood. The other was metal. These men had told him that with the wooden plow a man could prepare only 2 acres but with the metal he could prepare 10. Perhaps we might have found a way to put metal plows onto the Indian farms. Maybe we can yet. "Plows for India!" That would be a great slogan for some of our generous and practical friends. Maybe we could start something like that. They cost only \$2.60.

This noon I was asked, "Why does a man come back from India at this point

and say that some of the storage bins are filled with rice and the Government will not sell it?" May I suggest that the Government of India is very aware that there are no refills for those bins and that until there are definite assurances that the pipelines will be kept full from this end they dare not risk having none at all. When they know those bins can be refilled, they can use enough of that rice to keep the people from starving.

There has been asked here on the floor the question, "How is this grain going to get to the people?"

I have here a perfectly fascinating collection of papers and pictures showing the whole process, starting with the arrival of a wheat ship at Bombay and going all the way through, showing the care given the grain, the people queued up at the ration stations, and so forth. If you can pay you pay and if you cannot pay you do not pay. If there is no grain nobody gets any. I think there is no country in the world that has so fair a rationing system and so excellent a system of distribution of the ration food to the people as has India. The big problem is one of keeping the pipelines filled so that they can have something in their storage bins which they can distribute. If there is nothing in those bins nothing can be distributed.

I have here a number of editorials from some of our papers, like the Atlanta Journal and the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Macon Telegraph. They give so clear a picture that I confess I am a little surprised that more of our membership has not benefited from reading them in the Speaker's lobby.

It is asked—why should we do for a country whose spokesman is not too friendly—indeed when he is ungracious.

The fact that we do not agree entirely with the man who happens to be head of the Government was one of the reasons why we originals in this whole matter felt it would be of peculiar importance that the representatives of the people of America should want to do something for the people of India, regardless of the disagreements that might exist between our respective Governments. For that reason we were particularly eager that this gesture and this contribution to their very life should be made.

I want to say this, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the House of Representatives of the fact that we have been told in many ways, through many religions, and in many languages, but perhaps most pertinently in our own, that "he who loveth his own life over much shall lose it" and that the only way to retain anything is to give it freely. I am so certain that this is in conformity with a universal law which, if disobeyed, will bring down upon our own heads exactly what we earn by an unwillingness to share our plenty with the starving.

What do you think it means to the mothers in India to read of surplus grains in the United States when their children are starving to death? Does that bring us any friendship? And mind you, I am not buying friendship when I vote for this bill. No, I am doing what I

believe to be my human duty to other human beings, and I will do it in every part of the world it is possible for me to do it in and in the best way that it can be done, knowing all the time that unless I possess something I cannot give it away. So I must not be careless lest I have nothing to give.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very deeply on some of these matters because to me the very life of my own country is at stake—the spiritual life of my own country. Without the spirit there is no life. Unless we pull ourselves together, friends, and find again the basic principles of human understanding, the human give and take, the kind of thing that built our little villages in the beginning of our country, we may find ourselves lost. Now there seems to be no time for kindness, for the simple realities of community living. I am certain that unless we know that the universal law of life is a law of giving, that as Walt Whitman said, "The gift is to the giver and comes back most to him," then indeed will our Nation and our people be in grave danger.

I am so certain of that fact that I believe that these deeds come back most to us when we do these things which mean life to the children of tomorrow in other countries, but I am certain also that if we do not fulfill our responsibilities toward those in need across the world our own future is jeopardized to a degree that few of us here today can possibly appreciate.

It is a moment when we as individuals and as a Nation must remember that—

The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein.

Now and always it is His world, and all of us are His people. Yes, we must use our best intelligence in all we do. We must not waste, but we must use and with care. Wasteful extravagance, throwing things away, destroying them as we have been doing for the past 20 years, indeed for a century, is also a violation of the law. By what right do we throw out that which would be life to another? We should not forget that everything we eat dies to make us live. What right have we to life? Is it ours, or God's? What right have we to the death of all this that becomes us, unless we use it rightly, unless we share its equivalent that others too may live, and unless we can see clearly through the confusions that are thrown around us on every side, that we have a destiny in the world, that we may not have been fulfilling over well? To me food to India is part of our recognition of this destiny.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has again expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the very fine remarks made yesterday by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have thoroughly acquainted myself with the matter of

monazite sands in India. It is my considered opinion that the Senate took unwise and ill-considered action in accepting the Bridges amendment to S. 872. The amendment is embodied in the second half of section 6 of the Senate bill. The Bridges amendment requires that India use monazite sand and manganese as well as cash to pay for that half of the wheat shipment which is not an outright grant. Now there are certain faults on the face of the amendment—for example, it does not say how much monazite or manganese—but I wish to address myself to a much deeper implication in this section of the bill.

Let us take up the matter of monazite sand first. This sand—and this is common knowledge—furnishes thorium, among other elements. The United States Atomic Energy Commission definitely has an interest in the establishment of an agreement between our Government and the Government of India concerning monazite.

In 1946 India placed an embargo upon the export of monazite. We have done the same thing here in the United States under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. The reasons for this are obvious: they have to do with protection of local atomic-energy development, with neutrality factors, and, in India's case, with a desire to handle such a commodity in the best interest of that nation's economic program. In 1947 India made an exception to its embargo. It entered into an agreement with a private French company for the construction of a monazite processing plant in India in exchange for limited monazite shipments to France. I am told, however, the French company has not constructed this plant to date.

I am advised that negotiations between our Government and India concerning monazite are now pending. I have high hopes for the success of these negotiations. We are already receiving important quantities of other strategic materials from India, such as manganese, kyanite and others as a result of private negotiation.

I am convinced from the information I have received that if shipment of wheat to India is made conditional upon the export of monazite to the United States, shipments of wheat will be refused by the Indian Government. It would be refused because such a condition would be considered a flagrant invasion of India's sovereignty and it would seriously weaken the position of the non-Communist Congress Party in India. If the Indian Government were to accede to this provision it would give the Indian Communists (and there are many of them) the best issue they ever had around which to rally support from the Indian masses.

What is important, from our point of view, is that if India should be forced to reject our offer—shipment of all strategic materials to the United States from India might well be placed in jeopardy. Here is a rough idea of important items we are already getting from India through voluntary and amicable negotiations:

Eighty-seven percent of all imports of mica to the United States.

Fifty-five percent of all imports of kyanite to the United States.

Seventy-nine percent of all imports of jute to the United States.

Eighty-nine percent of all imports of shellac to the United States.

Thirty-six percent of all imports of manganese to the United States.

Twenty-nine percent of all imports of castor beans to the United States—for industrial lubricant as well as other lubricant use.

Ten percent of all imports of hides to the United States.

If all these supplies, including monazite, were cut off from the United States, one can see that the latter half of section 6 of the Senate bill is not a help but a terrible hindrance to our defense program. Not only does it prevent us from obtaining strategic materials but it makes us the worst kind of a Simon Legree in the eyes of the world. To insert this provision in the bill is to introduce a strain that completely blocks the quality of mercy in providing a starving neighbor with something to eat.

The inclusion of manganese in the provision introduced by Senator BRIDGES is equally ill-considered. We are already obtaining from 65 to 70 percent of the entire India output of manganese. Does it make sense to introduce an element of compulsion into the India-aid bill in a situation like that? I repeat, this provision may well end the strategic materials we are now getting from India. It will achieve just exactly the opposite result that it intends.

Members of this House have a responsibility—a responsibility to legislate in the long-range interest of our Nation's security, and an immediate responsibility not to handicap and destroy work now being done by the executive branch of our Government. I do not have to dwell on what effect this provision would have on our foreign relations. It would place us in the role of a bully who throws his weight around just to show he can get what he wants even if it is foolish to get it. Is that the kind of an impression we wish to create? Is that the way to win friends and keep our much-needed allies in this highly precarious conflict between communism and democracy as we know it?

This bill is founded on a humanitarian basis—that the American people will not stand by unmoved while millions of innocent people starve in India. It is contrary to the purpose of this measure that we should exact a pound of flesh for that which we seek to do out of our natural generosity.

Think of how Moscow has been interpreting this proposed amendment. Such propaganda opportunities are never lost on the Russians who seek to distort the aims of the United States. I urge the House not to give them further opportunity to distort our purposes.

It is high time we settle down to the gravest responsibility this country ever had—to help establish peace and justice among the nations and, above all, to defend our democratic way of life.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman knows the further fact, does he not, that as far as manganese and mica especially are concerned, they are extremely rare in this country; as a matter of fact, we do not produce more than 10 percent of our own manganese needs. According to the figures the gentleman has given 36 percent of our total imports of manganese come from India. I believe if the gentleman will go a little further he will find that 36 percent which comes into us represents more than 75 percent of India's production; not only that, but also we are getting it at a very reasonable price.

I think on the basis of the figures the gentleman has given and the statements he has made that our economic relationship with India in regard to these products is a very sound, very fine, and a very good one.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that particular point?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Not for the moment; I wish to comment on the question asked by the gentleman from Montana. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. Here we find ourselves in a situation where we have been getting the vast majority of our imports of these strategic materials from India by private negotiation. That seems to be a pretty effective means of obtaining the materials. I see no reason why we should throw that means of obtaining strategic materials out of the window by adopting a policy of compulsion.

Mr. COX. Now will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman favor extending this loan to India without obligating that country in anywise to make transfers of any of the minerals that she has in surplus and which are in short supply here at home?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I have talked about this to one of the outstanding businessmen of this country who is quite familiar with India. He has carried on business negotiations in India. He has also been responsible in large measure for the contracts that have been made for the purchase of these strategic materials. He feels under all the circumstances that the best way to do it is by private negotiation. I have confidence in people who are familiar with the facts.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman understand that India has placed an embargo on the exportation of monazite sand and that it is in short supply in this country?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman followed my statement, I covered that.

Mr. COX. I followed the gentleman's statement, but I did not get the point.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I stated that India has an embargo on monazite sands, the same sort of embargo that the United States has on all fissionable material. We have not only

put a ban on the export of it but it can not be owned privately in the United States. It is a Government monopoly.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman understand that the production of monazite sand in the United States amounts to very little, that there is only a handful to be obtained in Florida and that they are trying to develop it in one of the Middle Northwestern States?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Well, I know there is very little of it in the United States and I know that India is not the only country that has monazite sand. As a matter of fact, it can be found in Brazil as well as in India.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know that under India's persuasion Brazil has likewise imposed an embargo on the exportation of the sand mined there by an Illinois company at the invitation of Brazil.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman's argument does not quite make sense because here is the United States of America placing an embargo on the very material he is talking about.

Mr. COX. I would think that the gentleman would object to having his argument tested to the full extent also.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I take the gentleman's own argument. Is he opposed to the present Government monopoly on fissionable material, which is the law of the land?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. COX. I am opposed to letting India have one grain of wheat so long as India refuses to let us have the materials for which she has no use in the world except to convert into foreign exchange and which we need so badly.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer the gentleman by saying again that I have talked with a very substantial businessman of our country about this important matter. He is personally familiar with the problem. He feels very confidently that we can get this by negotiation. The past history of negotiation indicates that we can get this strategic material.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Georgia is talking about getting monazite from India as well as other strategic materials. Is it not a fact that the thing the gentleman from Georgia wants to do will defeat his own very purpose? We will not only get no monazite because it is prohibited from being exported from India but we will not get manganese from India and we are getting 75 percent of it now through negotiation as the gentleman has said. In other words, you will be cutting off the nose of the United States to spite its face.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is quite right. The moment you introduce the element of compulsion you will run into trouble. We have used

the art of negotiation to achieve this vast amount of material which the United States of America is now receiving from India. It is predicated upon the work done by an outstanding businessman. I have faith in our people who are handling the negotiations for this material.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is a very important member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Is it not a fact that there has been no shortage in the United States up until this time of thorium coming from monazite sand?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to call the attention of the committee again to a statement I made on yesterday as follows:

The Bureau of Mines has informed the committee that monazite and other rare-earth-mining operations in the United States now under way and planned indicate an excess of supply over demand adequate to meet our strategic objectives even without allowance for future imports and early United States self-sufficiency in these materials.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's fine comment. I may say with further reference to Brazil, so that we may clarify that point on monazite once and for all, that Brazil will agree to the shipment of monazite on a government-to-government basis. Such an agreement, as I understand it, only awaits the establishment of the necessary administrative machinery in Brazil. The trouble has been that an American company that has a monopoly on monazite, has refused to put in a processing plant in Brazil as requested by the Government as they refused to do in India, and that is why we have not been getting monazite from either India or Brazil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Atomic Energy Committee I want to align myself with the statement made by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], as well as the one made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] yesterday. I also want to make this statement, that the subject of monazite sands is not an important subject to the atomic energy development at this time in the Nation. It is used strictly from the standpoint of certain research, and there are other supplies available. The importance of the monazite sand argument rests solely upon the monopoly by a certain concern in Chicago that has been deprived of its supply of Indian monazite sands, and they have been the ones responsible for bringing the monazite argument into the discussion.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I cannot. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. COX. Well, I do not blame the gentleman, because that is not true.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All right, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says that the Lindsay Chemical Co. is responsible for bringing monazite into this picture.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman named the company. I did not name the company.

Mr. COX. I know, but I know who the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad the gentleman knows the company.

Mr. COX. I was working on that phase of the case before I knew that the Lindsay Chemical Co. existed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, I am glad the gentleman is that farsighted.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman would give me time, I would tell the story.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has had more time than I, and I am a member of the committee, and I will not yield further.

On February 8, 1951, the Government of India through its Ambassador, Madame Pandit, requested that the United States assist India in obtaining 2,000,000 tons of food grains to meet an unusual and critical emergency which threatened famine in many parts of India. The formal request stated that India "would greatly appreciate if the grain be supplied on special and easy terms."

In considering this request, an analysis was made of India's ability to pay for this grain. India is a new nation and has many fiscal problems. Her financial resources are very limited. It is very doubtful if India could comply with the previous loan qualifications of the Export-Import Bank. It was therefore thought advisable, both from the humanitarian standpoint and from the standpoint of supporting the new government in India, that the 2,000,000 tons of grain be given to the starving Indian people. It so happened that the United States was the only nation possessed of an appreciable surplus carry-over of grain from the previous year's crops.

It should be clearly stated that the starvation threatened in India is not the usual subnormal nutritional threat, which has always existed in India during normal crop years. This is an unusual famine condition caused by unusual floods and droughts in grain-bearing areas. It, therefore, was not the case of ordinary malnutrition which is always present, but malnutrition carried to the point of mass starvation due to the unusual conditions.

Strong opposition arose in Congress against giving the grain to India since they had requested it on a loan basis. This opposition was particularly strong in the House Committee on Rules, and approval of a rule was postponed for several months. The introduction of a bill with a loan provision finally occurred. A rule was reluctantly granted, and although an attempt was made on the floor to defeat the rule, that attempt was badly defeated by a vote of 211 to

13. The bill itself is now under discussion in the House.

In my opinion, H. R. 3791 should be passed. While I am not in favor of some of the public pronouncements of Nehru, and I certainly believe that the attitude of the new Indian Government of trying to appease Russia is a policy which they will sooner or later regret, I still can understand some of the reasons which prompt the weak, militarily and financially speaking, to take such a stand.

The new state of India is naturally somewhat nervous and apprehensive of the strong Communist governments of Russia and China, which lie near its northern border. India's leaders are also confronted with strong political opposition from within. The Nehru government with all its faults is a constitutional government, and it is definitely anti-Communist.

If the Nehru government should fall, it is doubtful whether it would be supplanted by a constitutional government. The chances are that the new government would be a dictatorship of either the right or the left. Under these circumstances, the investment made in supplying grain to millions of starving people in India accomplishes two objectives: that of feeding the starving and that of supporting a free government.

We cannot afford to stand idly by with tremendous surpluses of food while millions starve. We cannot afford it either from a humanitarian standpoint or from the standpoint of world prestige and world security.

World leadership has been forced upon us by developments beyond our power. We are being judged throughout the world by what we do on these great international problems. If we rise to the challenge presented and furnish the world real leadership, we will earn the respect of the rest of the nations, especially those of the free world. If we, through selfishness or lack of vision, fail to furnish this leadership, we will lose their respect and we will destroy their faith in the value of democracy.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. As a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, could the gentleman tell us how we in the United States could justify our embargo on fissionable materials, if we are asking other nations to break their embargo?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I cannot. I say that the sovereignty of India is just as sacred to them as the sovereignty of the United States is to us.

This problem must be viewed, therefore, not only in humanitarian terms, but in terms of effective leadership of world opinion.

I am confident that it is right morally, and right from the standpoint of strengthening the free world, for us to pass this bill and send our surplus food to the starving people of India. I am confident, if we press forward with faith in the rightness of our cause, that the Government and the people of India will be strengthened and will be friendly

to the other peoples of the free world when they are needed.

This extension of aid to India is an evidence of our maturity and the acceptance of one of the responsibilities of world leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one point about this opportunity to come to the aid of the millions that are starving in India. We are not dealing with malnutrition in India as it normally obtains there. This is an emergency that has been brought on by droughts and by floods, which causes malnutrition to advance into the area of mass starvation. So it is an unusual situation and is not the normal situation of malnutrition that obtains generally in India.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the people of North Dakota—that is a great majority of them—disapprove of the appropriations this Government has made to finance loans, which are never paid, and gifts to foreign countries and are disappointed with the money we have sunk in the Marshall plan and in the North Atlantic Pact. They feel that an end must finally be put to the spending of these billions and the increase of our taxes in this country.

But when it comes to feeding the starving, no matter in what country they may be, a different side of spending is realized. When we can do it, the people of North Dakota will be first to share their food with starving people. The feeding of the people of India for which this appropriation is asked, is not a war measure; it is not a gesture to secure support from India, it is a cause which appeals to humanity.

I am well aware of the action of India in these troubled times; I know they do not support us in the U. N.; I know they will not send any troops to aid the U. N. cause in Korea; I know they will appease Red China and Russia to any extent of which they are capable, and if I could retaliate against that Government, I would do it. We cannot retaliate against that Government without abandoning the people in it to starvation; and in the year of our Lord 1951, it would not be a thing a Christian nation should do, when it has the means of allaying that hunger and death.

To some it may seem that we shall never get anything back for this act or even any credit for it, but still it is the Christian thing to do. Maybe the benefits of this Nation will return a hundredfold by our following the right thing regardless of all consequences. It will surely be a demonstration to the world that there is at least one nation on earth that is not seeking pay for the good things it does.

We have given away billions for a lesser cause; we have poured billions into the British Empire until every bald-headed man in England is fitted out with a toupee paid for by the people of the United States. Along with these toupees we have thrown in, with reckless abandon, false teeth and eye glasses, while we have thousands in this country who have to go on through life bald-

headed, toothless, and unable to see where they are going.

You say, we only loaned this money to England. Well I wish some intelligent economist in this House would tell me the difference between a gift and a loan which never will be paid. England has not paid anything on World War I yet, well on this I will say that England's intentions were good. We made an adjustment with her and canceled the principal if England would pay 2 percent on the interest. She accepted the offer—who would not?—but stuck us again. She did not have the 2 percent so she gave us a note for that, and up to this minute she has not paid that note and, as I surmise has no intention of doing so. So while we collected that 2 percent interest we received no money but another note. In other words, she paid nothing and increased her note to us.

In this aid to the hungry people of India I dislike to assume it is a loan—in the end it will be a gift and why leave any cause to charge us with being a shlylock. The issue with me is to feed India with a gift of 2,000,000 tons of wheat, or refuse to do it. Forget the loan and not stir up in the minds of the people of the United States that we are making a good hard banker's bargain, when we know all the time we are making a gift. We are exercising charity so why make it appear as anything else.

There is only one condition I would require in aiding India. I would so word the gift that the 2,000,000 tons of wheat had to go to the starving people and not into the treasury of the Indian Government, or into the hands of food speculators similar to our experience in Greece. We should preserve the right in this appropriation to have a representative of this Government check the distribution of this food and prevent speculators and the Indian Government itself from profiting on the misery of her own people.

I have voted against all appropriations for the Marshall plan and for the North Atlantic Pact and every other appropriation intended to buy friendship, but I have never refused to vote for an appropriation to alleviate the suffering of starving people no matter where they are. The first-named appropriations went to support a policy—which I thought wrong—the last is an appropriation in the name of Christian principles of humanity. Remember that a good deed is never lost—it lives—and will come back to the doer a hundredfold.

While we have had experience in making these loans, we have never collected any of them except from some little countries.

Mr. JOHNSON. What about Finland? They have paid every dollar of their debt to us.

Mr. BURDICK. I was going to say a couple of the smaller countries, probably the least able of anybody to pay, have paid their debts to us.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I do not think the gentleman quite does justice to India by blaming her for all of the habits of the

British. The Indians have never yet defaulted on an international loan that I know of. They have the resources to pay the loan. I do not see why, if they remain independent, they will not pay. It seems to me a little unfair to blame them in advance with a lot of the frailties of our European neighbors when they have never yet exhibited those frailties.

Mr. BURDICK. I am a follower of Patrick Henry, and he said "There is no way of judging the future except by the past."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Do you not think we ought to give India an opportunity to prove whether she will or will not pay? It is such a young and new nation that it has never yet had an opportunity to fall down on meeting any of its obligations as have other nations. But just give India the opportunity and the time and she will probably default like her foster father, Great Britain, has defaulted on every loan we have ever made to it.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not think you will be disappointed. But I do not want to fool the American people right now into making them believe that we are making a loan. I am in favor of giving India the money to stop starvation. I will vote for what we have—it is not the way I wanted it, but I do believe that the way you have hedged this in in the bill is a good thing. You are not going to send any wheat over there which is going to interfere with the necessary supplies for this country because it provides in the bill that you cannot do that. Some might think I am in favor of this bill because I represent the wheat growers of this country, and that we are trying to get rid of some of our surplus, but that is not the case at all. We do not have very much surplus wheat in this country when you take into consideration the short crop which is coming up in the soft wheat belt. We better not talk too much about surpluses until the end of the season comes around.

Here is one thing I want to let you know—this Government has not spent a dime in supporting the price of wheat in America. It has not cost the Government a nickel. The fact is they have made \$49,000,000 by having the price support on wheat because the world market price of wheat has been ahead of what the farmers received all the time. I hope no one, and especially no one in the State of North Dakota, who happens to read what I have said, will draw the inference that we are selfish about the matter. I understand, and I believe I have reason for so understanding—or at least I can say I am satisfied that India is not going to vote with us in the United Nations. I am satisfied that India is not going to send forces to help us in Korea.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it not the conviction of the gentleman that India is pro-Communist and pro-Russian?

Mr. BURDICK. No, and I will tell you why. India will never be Commu-

nist, because communism strikes at two things—it strikes at capitalism—that is No. 1. The next thing it strikes at is religion, and you cannot do anything with the Indians when you attack their religion. I think they are perfectly safe so far as that is concerned.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I am the most yielding man you ever saw.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am delighted to hear that.

The gentleman, and many of the other eloquent speakers this afternoon, has given the impression that the United States has sent absolutely no grain to India. Is that the gentleman's conception, that we have sent no grain to India?

Mr. BURDICK. I was trying to find these sheets but you interrupted me and I confess I missed your question.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I happen to have been in touch with the Department of Agriculture this afternoon. I understand that during the last few months we have sent a considerable amount of grain to India. I do not understand we have been thanked for it, although Russia who has sent far less, has had very generous thanks and has been given great publicity. I understand we have shipped over 400,000 tons, which is a considerable amount. It seems to me we are rather at fault in not publicizing that fact. Of course, I realize we do not want to be thanked for our generosity. We are accustomed to being kicked in the teeth for giving away things, but I do think it might be well to publicize having given this wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to follow the genial gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], for whom we all have the greatest affection and respect.

I was interested in the fact, however, that he based some of his conclusions on the bad record of Britain. I would like to point out that until there was a collapse of the inter-allied debt structure throughout the world in the early thirties, Britain did not default in a single interest or principal payment due the United States. No private loan to Britain has ever been in default. However, that is not relevant to this question.

It seems altogether appropriate, whichever side we take as to the India problem, that there be continued reference to our religious ideals. I know that those opposing this bill are as charitable-minded as I, and in the presence of suffering would exhibit personal generosity. Whatever I say about the wisdom of the generous policy by our Government, I am sure that anybody with whom I differ will understand that it is not an indictment of viewpoints.

However, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] put her hand upon something that is basic in this whole discussion. It is that America, a favored na-

tion, cannot stand before the world with a surplus of food and let millions die for lack of it. We do not want an adverse judgment of history to be imposed upon us.

I do not know whether Mr. Nehru is a sound leader or not. I know that I disagree with some of his utterances, but I am sure I do not understand the Orient as well as I might. I am willing to grant that judgments should be reserved on some points as the new republics mature. We must be patient and tolerant for in the fundamental struggle they are on the free world's side. There are other sources of information than Nehru's speeches, statements that cannot be questioned that the situation in India is desperate.

In the final analysis, the vote of this House will rest upon that fact; that is, if we do not send grain, millions of people in India will die. I do not know how many. There is some question about that, of course, for disease factors enter the calculations. It is true that there is always some suffering in India, but it is not true that this is a normal condition or a continuing situation. We have an emergency to deal with. Let us make no mistake about that. It began with an earthquake, followed by floods, then a drought in another part of the country, and finally the locusts. India has had a series of disasters that should win the sympathy of the American people. The hunger of masses of her people is appalling.

Here is one basis for the insistence that hunger is widespread; it is a letter from the executive secretary of the Agricultural Missions, Inc., founded by Dr. John R. Mott. On its board of directors serves my good friend, a Member of this House, the gentleman from New York, RALPH W. GWINN. I refer to that because it is a leading organization in the field of missions. This is what one of the missionaries says:

We are nearing the end of February, but it looks like the height of the dry summer season. Our monsoon failed in October-November for the fourth successive year. We have not had a drop of rain since November 17 and things are dry, terribly so. We have installed a third Diesel oil pump in a desperate attempt to raise as much food as possible, since grains are so difficult to get to feed man and beast. Naturally the income from our farm has been affected very badly, and a serious financial situation faces us as it does all farmers in south India today. We do not know where we can find fodder for our cattle. We would like to sell some of our dairy stock, but prices are so low due to the fodder scarcity that we hesitate to "give them away," having spent so much time and money to breed and raise them. Food for our workers and students is no less desperate. I can assure you that the 2,000,000 tons of food India hopes to get from America is indeed badly needed. We have never faced a more desperate situation. The coming 4 or 5 months will be dreadful, we fear. I can see nothing else than sheer famine, starvation, and death for man and beast unless help comes and soon. It is impossible to exaggerate the staggering need.

So we are not depending upon the representations of Nehru for the conditions which the House Foreign Affairs Committee presents to this House in a plea for this loan for food.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand, the gentleman's argument is, and I am sure the gentleman attempted to justify it, that India needs this wheat for her survival; is that correct?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. For the survival of her people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, the survival of her people. The United States of America needs this monazite sand from which thorium is derived, and manganese for our survival in a dangerous war. If that be true, what would be un-Christian in having a little cooperation and understanding that we furnish the wheat and the food that India needs for her survival, and in return that India furnish us manganese and the monazite sand we need for our survival? Thus both these great nations can survive.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I get the gentleman's question and I think all the Members understand it. It is a question that may represent our differences, and the differences are not substantial unless the House feels that we should tie the hands of our negotiators. On yesterday the House received accurate information on this subject from the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and others serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I hope by this time it is clear that while we are entitled to ask India to meet our needs in such respects as she can, we should not place our negotiators in a position in which the whole transaction will fail if we are not able to induce India to meet all of the requirements of a rigid amendment. In that case we would lose minerals, India the food.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. On that point may I make an observation?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I cannot yield further; I am sorry.

I hope that when we get into a discussion of that question the House will hear us dispassionately; and, although we may have exhibited emotion about human suffering, I trust that our efforts will be regarded as consistent with our desire to protect our own country. If, as the gentleman from Ohio says, we can in this transaction secure a continued supply of manganese, or if India is in a position under her policy to give us other strategic material, then it is to our interest to do it. But we must not exploit suffering and widespread hunger, and we must not put the ECA that negotiates the terms in the position of turning down the plea for food.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. CHATHAM. For the RECORD, is it not true that the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], said yesterday that in our domestic monazite sands, production is scheduled to exceed domestic consumption of end production by the end of 1951?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is correct.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, may I just take this concluding minute to highlight the point that has been made. It is repetitious, but this is one of the fateful periods in human history and I believe, if I might speak with conviction, that much depends on the decision of this House when we take the final vote.

There is a precedent for this assistance. It is not the first time that the American Congress has been asked to send food to starving people. In 1921 the people in the Valley of the Volga River, millions of Russian people living under a communistic regime, asked for help and we sent it.

In 1924 the victims of an earthquake under the Government of Japan, a rising power that undertook to destroy and to enslave us, the millions of victims of an earthquake asked the United States for help and we sent it.

On many occasions the United States has been asked for help by the stricken people of Germany, those who rose against us, and because we did not propose to let suffering people die, we sent them help.

To the people of China, the flood sufferers in the valley of the Yangtze we have extended aid on more than one occasion.

We should be no less generous with the people of India.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cox: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951.'"

"Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized and directed to provide emergency food relief assistance to India on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (except that such credit terms shall provide for repayment by India of the entire principal of, and all interest on, any credit so extended not later than 6 years after the date on which such credit for India is established), including payment by transfer, or otherwise, to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the Government of India) of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources; such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, beryl, raw jute, and cyanite. The Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes for this purpose from time to time during the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 in an amount not to exceed \$190,000,000 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury who is authorized and directed to make such purchases; and in making such purchases, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized

and directed to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act, as amended: *Provided*, That with respect to the procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States: *Provided further*, That the assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of floods, droughts, and other natural disasters suffered by India in 1950.

"Sec. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to the extent that the President finds that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose: *Provided*, That pursuant to agreements made between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest not later than June 30, 1952, for such advances either from funds hereafter made available to the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, from receipts from vessel operations: *Provided further*, That pending such repayment receipts from vessel operations may be placed in such funds or accounts and used for activating and operating vessels."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this extension of time because I have not had an opportunity to address the House on the merits of the bill. The Committee on Foreign Affairs came before the Committee on Rules and asked for 2 hours general debate. That committee extended the time to 6 hours with the understanding that the opposition would have some time. I was not able to get one minute.

Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer as a substitute for the pending bill with some changes the bill recently turned out by the Senate which, in my judgment, is a very great improvement upon the House bill, but that bill deals with matters extraneous to the pending bill and therefore ran into the trouble of being subject to points of order, and because of that I have offered the substitute which is now before you.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eleven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of correcting a statement?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I am concerned about that because I have tried to be fair, and if the gentleman asked the Committee on Foreign Affairs for time, I did not know it or I would have given him part of my time.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman is always clever, and I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, the committee will observe that this substitute now before you having been offered by myself is the committee bill with two changes. On page 1, line 9 of the bill after the word "amended"—and if you have the bill before you I beg of you to refer to it—this additional language is proposed to be inserted "except that such credit terms shall provide for repayment by India of the entire principal of, and all interest on, any credit so extended not later than 6 years after the date on which such credit for India is established."

On that phase you will recall it was developed in the debate that the Committee on Foreign Affairs originally reported a bill to make a grant of 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India, and they made it a grant upon the ground that India could not pay for the wheat. If you will look to the report filed by that committee you will find substantiation for that statement. Then later they came back with the bill that is now before you to make a loan of \$190,000,000 to India and they take the position that India's resources are sufficient to make India a good risk, and therefore the transaction is a bona fide one, that the loan is a good loan, and that the loan will be repaid.

The Secretary of State took the position that while India had the resources with which to pay the loan they ought not to be pledged because it would embarrass India's qualifying for an industrial loan, which, incidentally, I should like again to inform you is for three-billion-eight-hundred-million-odd dollars, the greater portion of which she expects to get from the Export-Import Bank.

Let us go to the second amendment to the committee bill. On page 1, line 10, after "by transfer" insert a comma and the further words "or otherwise." That is a minor amendment, and I will not dwell upon it.

Then there is an amendment on page 2, line 3, and this I do believe to be of great importance. It was a point that was discussed at great length in the Senate. It was the Bridges amendment, which was adopted overwhelmingly. The language is this:

Page 2, line 3, insert before the period a semicolon and the following: "such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, beryl, raw jute, and cyanite."

I cannot conceive that this Committee would for a moment consider making a loan of \$190,000,000 to India without at the same time at least making some effort to assure India's repaying the loan.

You have heard advocates of the pending bill tell you that calling it a loan is a subterfuge. One of the last gentlemen making a speech supporting the bill, the gentleman from North Dakota, said that if you thought you were going to get payment of a dime upon this transaction you were fooling yourselves. So there you have it.

I want to inquire why there can be any possible objection, other than that offered by the Secretary of State, to requiring India to send us some of the minerals she has, some of the jute fiber she has, and which are in short supply in this country, we having no fiber and little of the monazite sand about which you have heard much.

Let me tell you just a bit about this particular commodity. India is the main source of monazite sand. Her production is larger and the quality is better than that produced anywhere else in the world. Next to India, Brazil has the greatest quantity. There is none in the United States except a little which is found in Florida which only amounts to a handful, and I believe it is in Nevada where they are undertaking to develop mines. But it is believed that it will take 2 years or more before it will be possible, even exerting our effort to the maximum, to get enough monazite to meet the requirements. India, I say, has that sand. She has it mined now. It is sacked and stacked up in the thousands and thousands of tons. But Russia came into India, and Russia dominates India, make no mistake, my friends—Russia came into India and influenced India to lay down an embargo against the shipping of that sand. That was not all. Indian representatives went to Brazil and influenced that country to lay down a like embargo—an embargo upon the sand which is mined by an Illinois company at the invitation of Brazil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to impose myself upon the committee, but some of these things ought to be cleared up. This Illinois company which is the principal chemist in that field made an investment above \$400,000 in Brazil and at the insistence of Brazil, but because of the interest of India the investment of more than \$400,000 is a total loss unless the company can export the monazite sand. Monazite sand is a vital and necessary material. Almost the entire output of the products of this Illinois company is taken by the Atomic Energy Commission. It is important. It is of no use to India except as she can convert it to foreign exchange. Something has been said about India wanting to process this sand herself. An endeavor has been made to coerce—mark you—an endeavor has been made to coerce and to drive this Illinois company to go

into India and develop such a plant. The development of such a plant there would mean the dismantling of the plant which is operating in this country. The operation of such a plant in India would be an economic impossibility. Into the plant of the chemist to which I have referred, there rolls every morning acids and alkalis totaling 400,000 pounds. India produces few of these acids. She produces none of the alkalis. She cannot process the sand. She entered into an agreement with a company in France. They found it likewise impossible to process the sand on an economic basis. But even since the laying down of the embargo India has exported certain quantities of the sand to a French company, whose name I could give, and with which there was formerly associated an outstanding French Communist. My dear friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, made a very emotional speech this morning, to which I responded. I want to say to you we cannot legislate upon the basis of emotion alone. He said he was in favor of something, and I want to join him and say, too, I am in favor of something. I think the one-worldism which we have been practicing has carried us to a dangerous extreme.

I do not see that it is possible for us to hold together and be a solvent, strong country, if we continue to carry on this give-away program. Yes, I favor something. I favor keeping flying the flag above the dome of this Capitol, which gives itself in complete fullness to the winds of God that blow. We must give some consideration to the ability of our people to carry on in this proposed fashion. I want to tell you here and now that if we ever mean to bring to an end this give-away program, here is the place to start.

I have asked this question and have had no answer from members of the committee, "Will the adoption of this bill mean this Congress committing itself to a give-away program that has already been outlined and which is being engineered by a Member of this House, that will call for the additional expenditure of in excess of \$7,000,000,000?" Are you for that sort of program? Are you prepared to make that kind of pledge? It is your problem. This is your country. My concern in its preservation is no greater than yours. Let us come together as responsible people, with a common concern, and make a decision that represents sanity, patriotism, and a concern for the solvency of this Republic.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] yesterday and today. I notice his complaint that he was given no time under general debate on this bill. I recall that on yesterday when we were considering the rule he monopolized more of the time than any other Member. Not only that, but when the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, went to

ask him for time he refused him and said he had none. Later, of course, he offered to give him 4 minutes, but then it was too late.

The gentleman from Georgia is making a great to-do about a give-away program. I should like to call to his attention the fact that I was one of those who opposed the original India-aid grant bill, because I felt that we should report out this measure on a loan basis, due to the fact that the Indian Government had asked for assistance on easy terms. Now the gentleman comes in, if I understand his amended bill correctly, with a new bill. Does this House not realize that he and his group are responsible for the bill which is before us at the present time? The Rules Committee turned down the original bill, and they told the Foreign Affairs Committee the kind of bill they would accept, and that is the kind of bill they got, a bill which calls for a loan, a loan which I understand will be worked out between the Indian Government and the ECA, a loan which the gentleman from Georgia wants to cut down to a 6-year basis and to which he wants to add certain amendments. I wonder if this House does not know by now what this particular substitute means. We are dealing with a new country, a country which has been in existence only a few years as a free nation. Here we are dealing with a third new bill on this subject, while we are discussing the terms laid down by the gentleman from Georgia in defiance of the wishes of the committee which brought out this bill. He brings up the question of monazite. I never heard of this mineral, or rare earth, until lately. The gentleman brings up the question of manganese. I know something about that, because it happens that in my State of Montana 90 percent of the manganese produced in this country is mined; but 90 percent is not a great deal, because all we can do at our very best is to supply 10 percent of our national needs. The gentleman brings up the question of manganese and says we should put clauses in this bill to make certain that the Indian Government will ship us manganese. They are shipping us approximately 40 percent of our total imports and needs. They are shipping us in excess of 75 percent of the manganese which they produce. These figures have been brought out by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], all members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Now we come to the question of monazite. I have read twice, and I am going to burden this Committee again by reading a third time just what the Bureau of Mines has to say about this particular substance, this substance which the Indian Government, I understand, has put under its own control just as we have put certain rare materials in this country under our own sole control. Here is what the Bureau of Mines says about monazite:

1. The Bureau of Mines has informed the committee that monazite and other rare earth mining operations in the United States

now under way and planned indicate an excess of supply over demand adequate to meet our strategic objectives even without allowance for future imports and early United States self-sufficiency in these materials. The only real concerns are for supplies to meet the needs for a short period in the very near future and to meet AEC demand if research determines that thorium is an important atomic raw material.

I should like to call to your attention that one of the arguments used against the present bill is that in view of our interest in a monazite supply and India's interest in a food supply reciprocity is not an unreasonable requirement. Reciprocity is never an unreasonable requirement. But, Mr. Chairman, this is a loan; it is not a give-away program as far as I am concerned, and I expect the Indian Government to repay this loan if the bill is passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that as far as I am concerned this is a loan; it is not the beginning of a give-away program for India or any other part of the Middle East. This measure is being advanced in good faith, and I am quite certain on the basis of the Indian Government's request for easy terms and assistance at this particular time that it is their intention to repay this loan as its earliest convenience.

I have heard some remarks about an American concern being interested in monazite in India. I have also heard members of the Atomic Energy Committee, Members of this House, state that at the present time negotiations are being carried on between this company and the Indian Government and between this company and the Government of Brazil. In both instances it appears that a favorable reaction can be expected; and on the basis of negotiations voluntarily entered into, not forced upon a government or a company, that it is possible that an agreement might be worked out. So when we consider these things let us look at the factors truthfully; let us not only recognize the humanitarian aspects of the people who are starving, of people who are the victims of drouth and famine, of the people who do need help, but also let us look at it from the practical viewpoint of the assistance which India has rendered to this country. Remember the amount in percentage of kyanite that we get from India, the manganese and mica and other minerals of which we are in short supply and all of which we need; think seriously of the economic relationship which now exists and let us defeat this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia and keep that economic relationship on a high plane.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee I have

made a special effort to look into the monazite question. I have tried to find out the significance of the Indian embargo to us. I have tried to find out what our real needs are for monazite and for the thorium and rare earths which can be extracted from it. I have tried to find out what other sources we have besides India and what our own production is and what we can produce should the need arise. I have also tried to find out what portion of our annual consumption of rare earths is for our defense efforts in contrast with our ordinary commercial needs.

The facts on this important matter have been stated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the distinguished vice chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee. I agree with the clear and pointed statement which he made yesterday and wish to underscore it by telling you what I have found out. In the first place, I think it is significant that despite the fact that India has embargoed monazite shipments since 1946 we have been able to fill our needs from our own resources and from imports from Brazil. In the second place, I want to tell you that although thorium and rare earths are important to our defense effort and this problem must not be neglected, their importance has been greatly exaggerated by persons lobbying Members of the Congress on this matter and by Members arguing for a monazite amendment to this bill. As to thorium, the distinguished vice chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee has already pointed out that at present thorium is not used in our atomic energy program except on an experimental basis.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Did I understand the gentleman to say something about lobbyists being up here lobbying for some part of this bill?

Mr. PRICE. I made a statement to the effect that Members of Congress have been contacted at great length on the question of thorium.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman overlooked the fact that the State Department has had five up here every day since consideration of this bill started?

Mr. PRICE. I am not entering into that argument with the gentleman from Georgia. I say there probably have been discussions on both sides of the question. I was referring to those who have been talking about the question of monazite.

This does not mean that we are uninterested in monazite. It does mean that there is no need for us to be stampeded into a foolish amendment which could only hurt our relations with India and could not help us to get the monazite we want. It means that we have time to work out our problems on a decent, sensible basis as one free nation does with another.

Now, as to the rare earths, I have been under the impression that great quantities of rare earths are currently needed for our defense program. This impression has certainly been given by lobbyists for this monazite amendment and by some Members speaking for it. I find,

however, the facts do not support this allegation. It is probably impossible to determine the exact quantities of rare earths which are needed for various items used in our defense effort since some comes in through commercial channels, but it is the belief of persons who are best acquainted with this matter that the use for defense purposes is a relatively small part of our total consumption. The use of the remainder for nondefense purposes is also not entirely clear, but some idea of it can be gathered from the fact that a spokesman for the industry which makes flints for cigarette lighters has declared that 90 or 95 percent of cerium salts, the major one of the rare earths, is used in the lighter flint industry. Now I do not mean to say that the lighter flint industry is not a respectable one or that you would not be inconvenienced if we had no lighter flints, but I do mean to say that this is the sort of situation which would make it laughable if it were not tragic that there should be a serious proposal that we should not send food to India to prevent perhaps millions of people from starving unless India will send us monazite to make lighter flints.

The real significance in the fact that the use of rare earths is a relatively small part of our total domestic consumption comes from the fact that our domestic production in the last 2 years has already been about 30 percent of our total domestic consumption. It is not necessary to assert whether this will cover all of our defense needs or not, because we already know that this year the stepped-up rate of our current production is nearly twice what it was last year and will be in the neighborhood of 60 percent of our consumption last year. I cite these figures because they show very clearly that if we need to we can meet our defense requirements for rare earths out of our own production. I do not think this will be necessary though because we have until recently been receiving a substantial supply of rare earths from our friendly neighbor Brazil and there is no reason to believe that the current discussions between our State Department and Brazil will not succeed in continuing this supply.

My conclusion from these facts is not that we should give up our efforts to make arrangements with the Indian Government. What I say is that this is a separate problem. It is the kind of problem which has been handled with complete success on such important raw materials as manganese and mica and others. It is the kind of problem which should be approached on the basis of friendly negotiation. We all know that the Indian people have just achieved their independence after hundreds of years of colonial status. We all know that they are just as jealous of their independence as we are of ours. We have only to think how we would react to a demand of the kind which this amendment would propose if such a demand were made on us. The sensible thing to do here is the American thing: Vote this bill without any gratuitous, insulting, demeaning amendments.

Vote it as an act of humanity in the American tradition. Vote it as a matter of American self-interest in the stability and progress of a nation of 350,000,000 people—the largest free nation in Asia—and then let our representatives sit down with the Indian Government in a calm and friendly negotiation.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to get a little light on this subject concerning which I frankly feel I am somewhat confused in view of the opposing statements as to the situation so far as monazite is concerned from the various people who have spoken with some authority here. In the first place, I want to make it very clear that I am definitely in favor of doing all within reason to provide humanitarian needs, that I am in favor of helping the people of India take care of their starving people, and if we can do it we should.

Now, on this question of monazite, whether or not it is important, and how much we are getting of it, I have a letter here that I think will be of some help in clarifying the point. I think we should know the facts so far as our sources are concerned and just how much reliance we can place upon statements that are not supported by facts. This letter was addressed to me on March 2, 1951, by the Munitions Board, by Mr. E. J. Lintner, and was in direct response to an inquiry regarding our monazite situation:

DEAR MR. KERSTEN: In reply to your letter of February 28, 1951, we are only too glad to supply you with the following information regarding monazite.

Monazite was included in the original group of critical and strategic materials covered by Public Law 117, June 7, 1939. The derivatives of monazite have a number of direct and indirect military applications, such as those in searchlight arc carbons, portable gasoline lamp mantles, radio tubes, radio condensers, aerial photographic lenses, optical glass itself as well as a polishing medium for the glass, colored eyeglasses, lighter flints, military pyrotechnics, as a scavenger in the production of explosives, as a purifier in certain alloy steels, and in the new cerium-magnesium alloy for jet engines. Normal United States annual requirements amount to approximately 3,000 tons of monazite.

The principal world sources of monazite are India and Brazil. Small quantities are produced in the United States (Florida and Idaho). For the period, 1940-50, we produced approximately 4 percent of our total requirements, the balance being made up almost equally by India and Brazil. It is apparent therefore that we depend very heavily upon imports.

In 1946, India placed an embargo on the export of monazite. However, we received a few hundreds tons in 1947, but nothing more since that year. In the last quarter of 1950, exports of monazite from Brazil were prohibited by executive decree. A bill that was signed by President Dutra on January 15, 1951, made the executive decree final.

In other words, our Brazil source was shut off at the beginning of this year.

The State Department is making every effort toward correcting the situation with the above countries.

I interpolate, I certainly hope they are.

Then there is a deletion of another portion of this letter for security purposes, and it closes:

In an effort to improve the stockpile position, we recently changed the purchase specification to cover not only monazite but also an ore known as bastnasite, that is found in California, Nevada, and the Belgian Congo, and the derivatives of these ores. These measures, however, will prove of slight help and our only hope of ample supplies will continue to be the existing world sources.

I have attempted to cover all the points raised in your letter and if there are any further questions, do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. LINTNER.

If we are to rely on our Munitions Board, we presently depend heavily on foreign sources for monazite. To those gentlemen who get up here and say that this is not so important, I say that your Munitions Board says otherwise. If we are to give the State Department in our argument and our debate here the idea that we are not too much concerned about it, here is the Munitions Board that says we are concerned. They are strategic materials, and we definitely depend upon foreign supplies.

Now, gentlemen of the Committee, what are the facts?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Stringfellow Barr, former president of St. John's College in Annapolis, has recently published an article, Let's Join the Human Race. In his introductory paragraph, he says:

If the American Government is to find a foreign policy, a policy that is constructive and realistic, we American citizens had better have a good realistic look at the human race.

Here are some significant facts:

Each day, on the average, 200,000 babies are born in this world. The chance that any of these will be born in the United States is 1 out of 20 and the chance of its being born in the Soviet Union is a little bit better. The chance of the child being born white is not more than 1 in 3. The chance of its being Chinese is 1 in 4. The chance of its being born in India is better than 1 in 9. If the child is born colored, it will probably be born either among people who have recently revolted and thrown out the white folks who used to govern them or else in a country that is still trying to throw the white folks out. The child that is born in Africa will probably learn this maxim: Never trust the white man. Each child born has about a 1 in 4 chance of being a Christian. It is far more likely that he would be Confucian or Buddhist, a Mohammedan or a Taoist. The child born in India has only a 50-50 chance of growing to maturity. In the case of the many colored children, the chances are overwhelming that he will be chronically sick for his entire life from malaria, or from intestinal parasites, TB, or other diseases and even if not chronically sick, he will be weak from hunger. The chances are 2 to 1 for each child born that he will suffer from malnutrition either from too little

food or from an unbalanced diet. The chances are very good, too, that each colored child will suffer from famine. The child born colored will have only 1 in 4 chances of learning to read. He will most likely live in a mud hut with a dirt floor, no chimney, and a thatched roof. In addition he is almost certain to work on land of the landlord, to be deeply in debt to the local money lender and to pay an annual interest rate of anywhere from 30 to 100 percent.

The issue today is a simple one. It is a clear one. I would not claim the time of the House to express my views if it were complex. I would remain silent while men more experienced in foreign policy, men with fuller knowledge of the intricacies of diplomacy, advised me. Some of the speakers today are trying to make this into a complex issue. They have spoken of its possible effect on our relations with Pakistan; they have suggested other complexities. Nevertheless, the issue before us today remains a simple one. It is a question of whether or not we will give aid to a starving people—to the people of a nation which does not have food, which could not have raised it, which cannot buy it.

In this situation, we, a Nation with a surplus of wheat, are called upon to share a part of that surplus. I know that our surplus is not sufficient to guard us against every possibility. Our carry-over is not large enough to supply the American people in the event of total crop failure in the United States in 1951. It may not be large enough to supply us if we have a 50 percent crop failure, but it is large enough to meet any reasonable or likely failure of our own crop. Our choice is then between withholding aid so as to protect ourselves against a most unlikely contingency, or of giving aid to meet a real and pressing need. Justice demands and charity urges us to act quickly.

Let us not propose seriously to use the starvation of a people as the direct means, as a lever, to advance our national or international interests. Let us act in this case with dignity, with reserve, with decency. Let us not conduct ourselves as though we were running the soup kitchen of a gospel mission, demanding that those who receive our soup, first sing our hymns and confess their sins. Let us not exact as the price of the bread we give, the self-respect, the integrity of the peoples of India. Let us not demand that they sing our national anthem, and confess their national faults. Soup-kitchen and bread-line conversions are notoriously short-lived.

Let us not succumb to the temptation to be dishonorable in the name of preserving honor, or indecent in the name of decency. Once we stoop to the use of dishonorable means, no matter how noble our purpose, our goal, may be, we shall have lost the cause. In that first compromise we sign the death warrant of honor, even though we sign it in invisible ink our enemies will cast it before us, blackened by the acid of time and we and our cause shall stand condemned by our own hand in the tribunal of history.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I had a good bit to do with drafting the committee bill. I want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, on adopting so much of it, but I respectfully differ with him with reference to the two respects in which he would change the bill. He proposes a time of 6 years. He proposes to add to the language which already requires repayment in strategic materials some extra special language along that line. Here is the trouble about it. When you provide certain requirements in advance with respect to a loan yet to be negotiated, you tend to tie the hands of your own negotiators because maximums become minimums and minimums become maximums. Statutory requirements or concessions cannot be used for bargaining purposes. It would indeed really be a pity if this whole thing fell through because India should say, "Well, we could pay it in 7 years, but not in 6 years," or "We could pay it in 8 years and not in 6 years." But if the substitute is adopted the negotiators' hands would be tied. Who would those negotiators be? We talk about the State Department all the time. Under both the gentleman's substitute and the committee bill the State Department will have a one-sixth voice in the matter. The negotiator will be Bill Foster, head of the ECA. He will have to get the approval of five others on the council of which he is a member. There will be Secretary of State Acheson; John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury; Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce; Bill Martin, head of the Federal Reserve; and Herb Gaston, head of the Export-Import Bank. We know those people, we have been assured that they will say, "If it is a loan which Congress authorizes, it is not going to be a fuzzy loan." We know if we are going to need strategic materials, we will need them for longer than a period of 6 years. How much of them do we need? The Cox substitute does not tell us how much. The committee bill requires that repayment shall include "materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies in its own resources." In addition to those words the Cox substitute says, "immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities," of named strategic materials.

When is "immediate"? How often is "continuing"? How much is "substantial"? Under the substitute bill you still leave discretion to those same negotiators to put reasonable interpretations on those words. Now, if you cannot trust those negotiators to be discreet and wise and to represent the best interests of our country, to make a good trade, if you cannot trust them, then you should not be either for the committee bill or the substitute. On the other hand, if you can trust them then do not stick language in the bill which is offensive to some thin-skinned people over there, which would require a change in their domestic law which we would be unwilling to make in our own law on monazite sands. Leave them something to bargain about. Here is one significant thing: House members of

the Committee on Atomic Energy have stood in the well of the House and have told you part of the facts. I suspect they have not been in a position to tell you all the facts about this monazite sands situation, except that they come to you and say, "Leave that part out of the bill. Everything is going along pretty well as is with reference to monazite sands." They say other things are more important and that you do not need this in the law.

Now, one more reason I hope this amendment is not adopted is that it attempts to put in terms, requirements, and conditions which we did not offer to the ECA countries and to Spain. It might be construed as an attempt to draw an international color line when we offer international loans. On the one hand we leave this council of negotiators with broad authority, which they have exercised in 13 cases in Europe, lending \$1,184,000,000, but when it comes to India we attempt to write in conditions which make it a different sort of thing, which are diplomatically offensive, but which still leave those negotiators with discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes. I ask this because the gentleman has great knowledge of the subject which he is discussing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman understand that the language of the amendment, to which he takes exception, is word for word the Bridges amendment to the bill that the Senate recently passed?

Mr. VORYS. I do, and I took exception to it there for the reason that it is needlessly offensive diplomatically, but it still leaves discretion to these same negotiators.

Mr. COX. Am I correct in remembering that the gentleman said on yesterday with respect to the other phase of the amendment which he has discussed that a 6-year loan was a much more rational transaction than a 35-year loan?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The gentleman also referred to a reference I made earlier where even a 6-year loan would not necessarily paralyze the Indian economy. However, a 6-year loan would desperately burden the Indian economy at a time when we all hope they will go ahead with some sort of improvement plan. The gentleman from Georgia pointed out the amounts that India would like to get for an improvement plan. My own feeling is there ought to be an improvement plan over there; but, just as in the Marshall plan, the swelling was reduced substantially before it came to Congress by those who originally proposed it, a similar reduction would have to be made in

the Indian improvement plan. The gentleman must remember there is further legislation coming up this spring with reference to regional economic and military plans.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has said he is opposed to making India a fuzzy loan. The gentleman's bill, with which he had much to do in writing and possibly wrote it, provides India an ECA loan.

Mr. VORYS. Authorizing the negotiation of a loan under that law.

Mr. COX. Contemplating that it will be a 35-year loan.

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. COX. As most all ECA loans are?

Mr. VORYS. No. Too many of them have been for 35 years, but the gentleman will remember when the matter was presented to the Rules Committee I urged a comparison between this and the Spanish loan, which was for 20 years.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman put his finger on a single ECA loan, unless it be the Spanish and Belgian loans, that is not a fuzzy loan?

Mr. VORYS. I happen to think that all of these loans will pay out if we have world peace. I am proud of the fact that I am one who insisted that we get some of our ECA activities on a loan basis.

Mr. COX. If we assume that world conditions will remain as they are, is there any reason to hope that we will get a dime of it? The gentleman must take consideration of the fact that we are now at war. This should make a very great difference.

Mr. VORYS. Yes. I think the gentleman's hopes and fears are like mine. We both are fearful of war, but our hope is that we can achieve world peace, law, order, and justice, and if we have that sort of a world India can pay back the loan, if we do not make it too long, and India will pay it back in things we need. But I want to leave the negotiators free to say how much of one or the other of these materials will be furnished over how long a period, and allow the negotiators to sit down and bargain with India in a way that two proud sovereign nations are accustomed to do.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VORYS. I must yield to my friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question of fact?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. India is indebted to the International Bank for \$64,500,000. Those are loans running between 15 and 25 years. Is it thinkable that a 6-year loan would be satisfactory for food purposes when India is able to get bank money from 15 to 25 years? And is not this getting to be a rear guard action?

Mr. VORYS. We all understand, of course, that a food loan is not a good kind of loan except that it is better for a person to borrow money to pay the grocer than it is not to pay him at all.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. VORYS. Let us not forget that it is a pretty simple thing we have before us here; India's people are hungry; famine is threatened for want of grain in

a hurry. We want some strategic materials they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. We want some strategic materials they have, not in a hurry, not in 6 years, but over a long period of years. All right; we get together; we do what India asks. Do not forget that when we grant them a loan we are doing what they asked.

If this were the last transaction we were ever to have with India that would be one thing and we should try to write everything into this bill. This is the first. We have had rather painful relations as far as I am concerned, based upon the position of India in the United Nations, but I do not think we should consider the views and sentiments of the Chief of State of India as the sole criterion for our friendship and relationships with India any more than the people of the world I hope judge the United States entirely by what our Chief of State says and does. I think that by going into this on a business basis, permitting these three Cabinet officers and three other officials to negotiate, we can meet the emergency needs of the Indian people and also have the beginning of what I hope will be a mutually profitable friendship. I urge you not to put in here limitations that will hamstring our negotiators when they come to the bargaining stage of discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for 1 additional minute that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement at the beginning of his excellent talk regarding the obtaining of strategic materials. Is the language in the bill of the committee, in the opinion of the gentleman, mandatory or permissive in that regard?

Mr. VORYS. The language of the committee bill is mandatory that strategic materials must be obtained. It does not spell out how much should be obtained any more than does the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that where an amendment is offered on the floor of the House that has not been seen by any of the members of the committee or the other Members of the House before its offering, that it should not be

considered lightly. This amendment contains at least one provision that was not raised in the other body and that is an entirely new one here; for the first time it brings in jute and jute products among the materials of which a continuous flow is required from India in substantial quantities.

I know something about jute because some of the largest producers of jute products are in my State. I also know what great concern the farmers of this country have in a continuing supply of jute. But take the requirement that India must furnish us a continuing supply of jute and jute products; it so happens that India does not produce jute except in very small quantities. The old India under British domination before the division between Pakistan and India produced it in large quantities, but the jute was produced almost entirely in Pakistan and not in India proper. As a matter of fact, the trade agreement recently entered into between India and Pakistan required Pakistan to supply India for processing in India's mills a million bales of jute by June 30, 1951, and two and a half million bales in the next 12 months. The scarcity of our supply of jute today is due to the fact that India and Pakistan had a tremendous row in their trade dealings owing to the fact that Pakistan did not devalue her currency whereas India did, and it was not until the middle of March that this trade agreement was finally reached. However, at any moment Pakistan may say to India: We will not send you any further jute.

At that point we will be requiring India to supply to us something which India could not possibly supply because India has not the jute production.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman overlooked the fact that in carrying on this trade warfare against Pakistan, India has tried to destroy her economy and to break down the profits that Pakistan would obtain?

Mr. HERTER. I am merely pointing out that you cannot require the delivery of something the country has not got itself.

The second point has to do with the 6-year repayment schedule. I do not know whether the gentleman from Georgia who offered this amendment figured how much India would have to repay per year and how that would affect her own financial situation.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman let me answer that?

Mr. HERTER. I will give the figures myself, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. COX. I have examined everything that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys] has said on the subject, and I arrive at this 6-year figure because he used it in this minority report that he filed which, as I said on yesterday, knocked the brains out of the committee report and killed the committee bill.

Mr. HERTER. I am sure the gentleman had some good reason for the 6

years. But I would like to point out that 6 years would require India to pay back in dollars \$36,000,000 a year for the next 6 years. The Indian balance-of-payments picture is not a very good one to say the least. India is 5 years old. She has had five independent years. During that time the only reserves that she had on which to back her currency and on which to purchase what she needed in the outside world was money which was blocked, the blocked pound, which remained in Great Britain and which had accumulated for India on account of war purchases. These have been reduced one-third of their total as of the present time.

In 1950, for the first time India reached an approximate balance of trade.

Her exports and imports were approximately in balance. But now she has had to use almost every dollar that she could accumulate for the purchase of food. The gentleman from Georgia is entirely right that she has purchased 500,000 tons of food from us. But she is at the end of her dollar rope and that is the reason she came in and asked for this special treatment. The gentleman's amendment would put on her a burden of \$36,000,000 per year. Possibly she can pay it, but obviously whoever is negotiating the loan should have sufficient freedom to be able to take a look at her economic position and make certain she is not being strangled by too heavy a payment when she is trying to get on her feet and having a difficult time doing it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today I had something to say about the proposition that is now before us and about my own fundamental convictions on how matters of this sort should be approached.

It has always seemed to me that in foreign policy matters we ought to keep in our minds the question of our own enlightened self-interest. To my mind such a view is entirely compatible with our meeting such responsibilities as may be ours in the world. So far as I have observed, those same motives pretty well govern other nations in their relationships with the nations of the world. I also said that I know a great many people want to support this legislation if an arrangement can be worked out that is mutually satisfactory and advantageous. That necessarily means satisfactory to the parties, India and our Government, and advantageous so far as it is possible to make it advantageous to India and to our Government and to our people. Certainly, on my record no one can rightfully challenge me on my position in respect to these matters that have come before us. A great many people have criticized me on occasion for going along too far in trying to work out some of these problems. Others have criticized me for not going along far enough.

I referred to the Economic Cooperation legislation earlier today. I said I supported it, and I did. I think it has done much good. I think also in retrospect, and having learned of some of its operations as I have in recent months, that it could have accomplished much more for us and our own interest and for the welfare and the stability of the

peace-loving peoples of the earth. We should have seen to it that there was coming to us, yes, and operating among the beneficiary nations themselves, more of a quid pro quo, that might reasonably be expected to go along with the things that we were undertaking to do.

Now, what is the situation that this amendment presents? First of all, I question the limit of 6 years. I have never discussed the matter with the gentleman from Georgia. Perhaps 6 years is too short a period, although certainly it would seem to me that some reasonable period might well be included in this legislation. Possibly we did not have it in other legislation that has gone before, but we are dealing with this legislation now, and I think we have a practical problem.

Secondly, everyone admits, and the committee in its report admits, that India produces and has materials that are needed here, materials essential in our own operations both at home and as we attempt to make ourselves strong for whatever may confront us on the international front.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Merely to point out to the gentleman that every one of these materials, except monazite, we are getting the vast majority of today, and there is no reason to believe that it will not continue.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, my understanding is that they have not been coming to us in the quantity that they might.

I want to cite the committee report, and after all I think we ought to be able to rely on the committee report. If you have a copy of it look at page 6. It refers to a number of materials which India possesses, regarded by the United States as strategic or critical. The following commodities are No. 1 on the stockpile list: Beryl, castor oil seed, chromite, coconut oil, cyanite, manganese, mica, monazite, opium, pepper, natural rubber latex, rutile, shellac, talc, and zircon. It makes reference to jute, mentioned by my very able friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. Then in the next paragraph it says the export of some of these materials, notably beryl, monazite, and raw jute is prohibited. Those are three of the articles that the gentleman from Georgia talks about in his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Then the report says:

All of these materials are vitally needed by the United States. Although the computations are made in dollars, based on prices, repayment of loans in kind, and barter transactions, are well established in United States policies. The committee believes this means of repayment should be utilized where possible in this transaction.

However, the committee does not believe it desirable to put the loan in a strait-jacket by requiring payment in kind as the only means of discharging the loan. For this reason, the language is permissive. At the same time, the committee desires to point out that the permissive language is not an invitation to the executive branch to ignore the responsibility to acquire these strategic materials wherever possible. With due regard for India's policies on strategic and critical materials, the committee desires to observe that in the long-term view, strategic materials are as vital to national survival of the United States as food grains are to India.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Does not that mean in effect that the committee in its thinking wants barter transactions, wants immediate returns in terms of material; and in effect does not the 6-year amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia mean increased pressure upon the Indian people to pay off in those necessary materials?

Mr. HALLECK. I think if the 6-year provision were adopted, and, as I said, I personally am not sure but what that is too short a time, it undoubtedly would exert that kind of pressure. I want to commend the committee on going as far as it did in pointing up the desirability, if not the necessity, of trying to get some of the things we need as we give to India some of the things India needs.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does the gentleman know how much manganese we got from India last year?

Mr. HALLECK. No, I do not know in tons.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does the gentleman know how much mica we got from India last year?

Mr. HALLECK. No, I do not know in tons.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does the gentleman know how much burlap we got last year?

Mr. HALLECK. No.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Then it is evident the gentleman is talking generalities and does not know the facts.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman from Connecticut that he may claim to be an expert in all these matters, knowing all the details of tonnages, and I am perfectly willing to grant him that privilege if he wants it. But I take it he joined in what the committee has reported, and that report itself recognizes the need and the equity of obtaining these materials from India. Obviously the committee, in its study of this matter, believed that we should try to obtain more of these materials, much needed in this country.

I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS] very properly said the additional language contained in the substitute in these words "such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, beryl, raw jute, and cyanite," yet leaves to the negotiators, the administrator, a permissive operation. There is no absolute requirement, as the gentle-

man from Ohio pointed out, that we get any given quantity of jute or any given quantity of anything else. But what does the language do? It imposes upon the Administrator of the ECA and other representatives of our Government who are going to make these negotiations on our behalf an added obligation. That obligation is to do everything they can within reason and honor to get as many of these materials as they can. This is for two reasons: First, that we get repayment as we go along; and, second, that we get as great quantities as is proper and fair under the circumstances of these materials that are badly needed for our own economy and national security.

In other words, so far as I am concerned, and going back to my original thesis, we want to help the free peoples in the world. We want to help people who need food, but we must recognize that America is not a bottomless barrel to be tapped for everybody at any time or for any sort of purpose that might strike somebody's fancy. We must recognize, as I see it, that as we go along helping other people, we ought to try to get them to help us as much as they can, whether it is fighting in Korea or getting the materials we need here at home to maintain ourselves, making it possible for us to go on trying to be a potential force in the world to help free peoples who look to us for guidance and support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I have been examining the report and I find there is no statement in the report as to the quantity of normal consumption or the amount available to India. There is absolutely no justification for any operation so far as the report is concerned. I wonder would the gentleman be so kind, if he would, as to enlighten us on that question.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say to the gentleman that India at the present time, because of this drought and other conditions, is short approximately 6,000,000 tons of wheat. India is purchasing throughout the rest of the world, including the United States, 4,000,000 tons, and is now 2,000,000 tons short.

Mr. TABER. What is the normal crop in India, and what are the normal importations?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. May I suggest that there is a special memorandum of information on the India Emergency Assistance Act at the table here, which contains the most complete and thorough information on that subject beginning at page 6. The gentleman from New York can probably acquaint himself fully with that matter by just reading that report.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I will be glad to supply that information for the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the difficulties so far in the discussion is the use

of so many generalities. The gentleman from Indiana certainly gave a very impassioned argument to the House, but he cited no facts to us. He made a great to-do over the fact that we needed these strategic materials and were not getting them from India. I asked the gentleman when he had the floor if he knew what we were getting and obviously he did not have that information.

The House should know that in 1950 the United States received from India 576,454 tons of manganese, which is approximately 75 percent of India's export production of manganese. So far as mica is concerned, we received 211,725 hundredweight, which again is about 75 percent of its export of mica. When it comes to jute and jute goods we received 217,452 tons, which is approximately, when we consider burlap, and that is what we basically need in this country, about 65 percent of the Indian export of burlap and jute products. When you consider that in 1949, prior to the war, we were receiving about 53 percent of India's burlap exports and in 1950 we received about 65 percent of India's burlap exports, can it be said that we are not getting a fair proportion of India's exports of the critical materials that we need?

I wish to point out something about the high cost of burlap, because there seems to be a lack of understanding among the Members of the House and the users of this product. The reason the prices have been high is due to American profiteering and not to Indian profiteering. In 1949 the gap between the landed price of burlap and the market price in the United States on the most widely used type was one-tenth of 1 cent a yard. In October 1950 the gap between the landed price of burlap and the market price was 15.4 cents a yard. So if you talk about the rise in price of burlap, look to your American dealers and not to the Indian Government.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The figures which the gentleman quoted as regards the exports of manganese and jute were for 1950?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Could the gentleman advise us as to whether or not India has, in recent months, placed any embargo on the shipment of these items out of India?

Mr. RIBICOFF. They have not. As far as these items are concerned, we are getting even a larger proportion during 1951. There was a temporary embargo on jute, but not burlap, when India was short on raw jute from Pakistan. I might state, that, due to the settlement of India's trade quarrel with Pakistan, and more jute coming into burlap manufacturing markets in India, we will now start getting more yardage of burlap.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman should point out the percentage you are getting of these critical and strategic materials, and the fact that long-term contracts exist on practically all of them.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question? Do I understand it to be the consensus of the Members of the House on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that you are satisfied with the monazite world situation as it affects the United States, without the necessity of requiring monazite sands from India?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct, as it exists today. For the future no one can predict the need that might come into the picture.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I might point out to the House that we are talking about today. We are talking about India's food needs for 1951 and not for the next 25 years. If we are talking about India's food needs for this year, what right have we got to talk about monazite for future years, especially in view of her long established embargo policy and the statements from the gentleman from North Carolina.

The statement made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] certainly demolishes completely the argument that has been made by the proponents to put a condition of monazite in this bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. COX. I would like the gentleman to yield in order that I might ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] if he knows what quantity of monazite sands are available to the United States.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman recalls that I went over those figures yesterday in the Record. At the present time there are monazite sands available to this country, government to government, from Brazil. Monazite sands are available to us from Idaho. The only question which the gentleman is concerned about is because of the fact that we have one manufacturer in this country that wants to buy monazite sand from India today at \$35 and he has to pay the Idaho miners \$235 a ton for it.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know that the concern to which he has referred is a concern that went to Brazil and developed two mines at the instance of Brazil?

Mr. DURHAM. And he was offered the same proposition in Idaho and would not accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] at the beginning asked me about India's total food requirements. I should now like to state that India's total minimum food requirements for 1951 for its 350,000,000 people were 50,670,000 tons. The total production of food grains in India was 43,770,000 tons. The total available pipeline supplies was 700,000 tons. Purchases by India and allocations and transfers under International Wheat Agreement was 3,090,000 tons. Assistance requested from the United States is 2,000,000 tons. This gives a total of 50,370,000 tons or a balanced need of 300,000 tons. In other words, this 2,000,000 tons just about takes them under their total requirements, their absolute minimum of 50,670,000 tons for 1951.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to bring to the attention of the committee while the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. DURHAM], is here, the fact that he is the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic energy. On yesterday he told this House, if I remember correctly, that manganese was the vital product at this time, and the gentleman from Connecticut has brought out the fact that in excess of 75 percent of India's production is imported into this country, and that that comprises about 40 percent of our total need; so we should not underestimate the importance of manganese in the steel and related industries.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Just by way of filling out the answer to the question asked by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. TABER], the production of food grains in India in 1950 was 49,240,000 tons. The production this year is 43,770,000 tons; and that is where the famine shortage exists.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make a statement. A number of Members have been seeking recognition for a long while. The Chair is endeavoring to follow two well-established practices, that of recognizing first members of the committee, otherwise alternating on either side of the aisle.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member of the committee and is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, there is a defect in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] that may have escaped his attention. His amendment requires that the Government of India shall keep a continuous supply of these materials flowing. I should like to point out that the trade so far between the two countries, India

and America, has been between private business concerns and not between the governments of the countries themselves.

As to manganese, I come from the city of Pittsburgh and represent a large part of it. We use tremendous quantities of manganese in the steel industry, as you know, and if we do not get this strategic material, our mills and our economy will shut down. You may ask us in Pittsburgh: Has the flow of manganese from India been satisfactory? And that is the question the gentleman from Indiana asked, Have the United States mills and factories been getting the vital material? I say to you as a Representative from the great industrial center of Pittsburgh: There certainly has been full cooperation in the delivery of manganese from India to date.

Indian exports of manganese to all countries in 1950 totaled 795,000 tons, and we in the United States received 585,000 tons from India. That has been keeping our mills running, and has increased the strategic stockpiles.

The stockpiling purchases by the United States Government of manganese from India have been made only through private importers. There has been no purchase whatever from the Government of India. I believe therefore that the Cox amendment has this defect in it, that it departs from private enterprise and goes down the socialistic road through a basic concept of state trading instead of private enterprise. I have heard everything when I hear that promise from the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I should like to say to the gentleman that there is no defect in the amendment, that the amendment was drawn as intended for the acquisition of these minerals to add to the Government stockpiles.

Mr. FULTON. I am sorry that I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. COX. It was necessary in order to meet a situation over which we had no control. The State Department is in this picture, you have to recognize them as being in the picture and you have to deal with the situation with that knowledge.

Mr. FULTON. Now that the gentleman has brought up the United States stockpile, 37 percent of the total manganese imports in the year 1950 went into the United States stockpile. This was done through private importers exclusively without the State Department being in it, and I will stand on that statement.

Mr. COX. But under direction that it should be fed to private enterprise by the Government. The gentleman will find that provision in the law.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman refers to the committee bill. Of course, if he will observe, the language in the Cox substitute in respect to the Govern-

ment of India is the same language as contained in the committee bill.

Mr. FULTON. But, as the gentleman knows, the form of this particular committee bill was a bill forced by the Rules Committee. It was indicated that if we came before the Rules Committee with this kind of a loan bill the legislation would go through. Now we come here with that kind of a bill and we find the greatest opposition from several ranking members of the Rules Committee on the very provisions we were asked to submit.

May I then ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] this: He has asked yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] the following question:

I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] if he would construe the adoption of this bill—

That is the committee bill—

to mean that Congress commits itself to giving like treatment to a dozen other nations now sitting on the steps of the Capitol?

Mr. COX. Exactly so.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman has the same inferred defect in the amendment he has offered because he also has a loan provision, simply reducing the loan from approximately 20 to 6 years. So the gentleman from Georgia is encouraging the 12 nations to sit on the steps of the Capitol by his amendment, just as he infers the Foreign Affairs Committee bill would do.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I ask the gentleman if he would construe the adoption of this amendment as giving a commitment on the question of granting aid to other countries, now sitting on the steps down here and in the galleries, on the same terms as given to India?

Mr. FULTON. I do not consider this bill as any further commitment whatever. But I do say if the gentleman from Georgia sees as the defect in the committee bill that there is such commitment, the same defect is likewise in the gentleman's 6-year-loan amendment, which he now sponsors. So the gentleman is hoisted by his own petard.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not very clear as to why this amendment has been offered; that is, this is nothing but a rear-guard action to defeat the whole bill?

Mr. FULTON. Yes, and may I point out that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] was the one who stood on the floor of the House here yesterday and pleaded: "Do not by any means even pass the rule; do not consider the legislation." I ask the gentleman from Georgia does he really wish to press his amendment offering a 6-year loan to India?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have been one of those who has been seeking recognition and I am apprehensive that at this hour of the day a motion will be made to curtail debate which will leave those of us who have been patiently awaiting recognition an opportunity to speak only for a minute or a minute and a half. I shall have to object pretty soon to any further extension.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the question is: Is the gentleman from Georgia logical in his objection to a loan earlier and in his complete opposition to the rule, or is he logical now in asking for a 6-year loan to India by his amendment? In which position is the gentleman from Georgia right, and in which is he wrong?

Mr. COX. I may say to the gentleman that I have never made a statement upon this floor in which I was not sincere.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman, but the question is, when was the gentleman correct in his positions, yesterday or on his loan amendment to India today.

Mr. COX. I am undertaking by this amendment to make the bill less objectionable and I want to say to my colleagues that I am still opposed to it. I am still opposed to granting a loan to India.

Mr. FULTON. Then the gentleman is one of those Members who will vote against his own loan amendment?

Mr. COX. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FULTON. Is the gentleman then one of the Members who will vote against the 6-year-loan to India amendment which he now proposes?

Mr. COX. I made my position entirely clear. I said I am undertaking to make the committee's bill less objectionable. I do think the adoption of the amendment will improve the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to ask my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] a question. Assuming, by chance, that your substitute should be adopted, would you then vote for the bill on passage?

Mr. COX. I said at the outset I take the position that the loan ought not to be made. I have not run away from that position. Does that make my position clear?

Mr. FULTON. Returning to our supply of strategic materials, we cannot afford in this country to have shipments of mica from India shut off either, for sonic instruments in which mica is used are vital for the defense program. We have had come from India 134,855 hundredweight of mica in 1950 for our

strategic stockpile, we must remember. If Congress should put these rigid and unacceptable conditions on the loan, India is probably going to say: "The United States would not be acting as a friendly nation but is dealing tough; India will shut off the strategic defense materials India is even now freely supplying the United States."

Cooperation, mutual trust, and reciprocal trade, would immediately cease, a series of reprisals would begin, and neither our honor nor our defense program, nor our industrial centers such as Pittsburgh can afford it. We should not cause such a disastrous break in our historic friendly relations with India.

Substantial contributions were made by the Indian subcontinent to the Allied war effort during World War II. We needed India's friendship then, and we need and should prize our mutual friendship now.

The Indian Army, which was then composed of men now belonging to both the Republic of India and the Dominion of Pakistan, reached a peak strength of over 2,000,000 troops during the course of the late war. Of these 943,000 served overseas. The Indian Army suffered 106,594 casualties including 36,696 men killed. This Army won more than 7,000 awards. Included in this figure were 31 Victoria Crosses, a very high number of the highest award which can be bestowed in the British Empire. These Indian men volunteered to fight side by side with our fine United States troops. The largest volunteer army in World War II was India's without a draft.

Some of the more notable campaigns in which the Indian Army participated are listed below:

Africa: The Fourth and Fifth India Divisions fought in Africa with distinction, and played a prominent part in the final action which was climaxed by the capture of the German general, von Arnim, successor to General Rommel. General Arnim was forced to surrender to the Indian formation. Previous to this engagement the Indians were active in driving the Italians out of East Africa and Ethiopia.

Italy: Three famous Indian Divisions played significant roles in the campaign in Italy. The Eighth Indian Division entered the campaign in October 1943, the Fourth Division in December 1943, and the Tenth Division in April 1944.

For 2½ years of the North African campaign, India was responsible for supplying the bulk of stores for this theater of operation. Allied troops in the Middle East wore clothes made in India and walked in boots supplied by Indian factories. Nearly 90 percent of the tents, canvas ground sheets, etcetera, used in the Middle East came from India. All in all, India shipped 1,500,000 tons of stores to the Middle East. Included in this figure were: assault craft, camouflage paints, nets, medical stores equipment for the comfort of troops.

I wish to call attention to the statement of May 23, 1951, from the United States Department of Defense in regard to India's contribution to World War II,

submitted to me by Lt. Col. Tudhope of the Department:

With regard to the contribution made by India to the war effort during World War II the following statements may be made:

1. India raised an army (exclusive of navy and air force) of peak strength totaling 2,049,317 men as of July 1945.
2. In connection with battle participation, India furnished 16 divisions in January 1945.
3. By the first month of the United States participation in the war (January 1942) India already had mobilized 13 divisions of which 5 were in combat. These divisions were raised from an initial arm force of 180,000 men.
4. It can be said that India held the Middle East for the Allies from 1939 to 1942. This is the time of the African-Libyan campaign.
5. India also contributed largely to the reconquest of Burma where 11 Indian divisions were committed.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India, had come to no resolution thereon.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this late hour of the day to make a simple announcement.

I am chairman of the subcommittee that has been investigating the Reserve activities. I have received many inquiries from Members of Congress and from the public generally as to why the delay in handling the affairs of that subcommittee regarding the Reserve components.

The reason is that we must wait until the manpower bill is disposed of by the committee of conference. It is obvious to all of us who have thought about the Reserve program that we cannot proceed to write legislation when we do not know what the over-all manpower picture is going to be. If, for instance, we have a bill voted into law which will give us universal military training, following which the Reserves will be placed from 6 to 8 years in Reserve components, we can write one type of bill. On the other hand, if we are thrown back on a voluntary program where the Reserve organizations must be built on a purely voluntary basis, an entirely different type of legislation is in order and will have to be enacted.

In considering the present state of the Reserve situation with all of the troubles that the Reserves have had, it is going to be extremely difficult to write any kind of voluntary Reserve legislation at the present time.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CLEO C. REEVES, FLOYD L. MURPHY, AND FABIAN P. DURAND

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$150" and insert "\$123."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$410.10" and insert "\$168.10."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the amounts in the Senate amendments are lower than the amounts in the bill as passed by the House?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, having observed some of the confusion which has been created in American thinking as to far-eastern matters, I feel compelled to present information that has come to my knowledge.

Asia is in the throes of rethinking its economic, religious, and sociological approaches to life. Many have heard there was a better way of life. For eons of time, and also true today, a full stomach is the chief desire of the masses of the people of Asia. This is quite a contrast to America, where we are laboriously trying to keep our middles within reasonable bounds.

The Japanese have studied our free-enterprise system and they like it. They have made vast progress. This has been done in spite of the lack of natural resources.

What is another great desire of the people of Asia? A little plot of land to call their own. They crave to run their fingers into the soil and say, "This is mine." A closeness to the soil spells security to them.

The Communists are not coming into Asia promising collective farms and

Marxian ideology. Instead, they have been constantly pointing out weakness in the old order. Their chief weapon is creating a caldron of dissatisfaction. As the dissatisfaction mounts they worm their way into the leadership of the opposition to the existing government. The Communists expect when the government fails to take over the control.

In Asia there is a very small middle class. Our democracy thrives in conjunction with a vast middle class. Communism is set up to give its strongest appeal to poverty-ridden countries. In a few simple words, if we expect democracy to grow in Asia there must be a spread in the ownership of land and an increase in the standard of living of the masses of the people through a system like the point 4.

Preparation for war is essential. We must have sufficient materials and manpower to stop imperialist Russian communism and then see to it that Russia knows we have this power. If we are strong Russia will delay action in the hope that we will someday be weak. In order to remain strong, we must have a positive build up of the ideals in which America was cradled. Our ideals belong not only to us, but to mankind. For others to acquire our ideals insures them and us a protection of a good standard of living. It is essential then for us to re-subscribe to the ideals of 1776. Our way of life is dependent not only on subscribing to such ideals, but to extending them. It logically follows that the propaganda budget must be expanded. Exchange students, professors, and outstanding young leaders of their farm groups must be brought over to see our way of life in action. Otherwise, it means constant war.

This is a positive approach. Our ancestors had a positive grasp of religion and economics. I definitely feel if we had spent more money on missionaries we would be spending less today on war. Missionaries were demonstration agents of our way of life.

Let us look beneath the surface of the revolution in China and inquire "what happened, and why?"

Three factors explain the Communist success in China: First, the collapse of the old Confucian social structure; second, Marxian promises; third, the growth of a strong national movement.

The Communists took advantage of the decadence and collapse of a social structure that had been held together by the ethical concepts of China's ancient philosophers Confucius and Mencius, for 2,500 years. The scholar-official class stood at the head of this system. This group served as the guardians of China's cultural past by setting the proper example for the people. It was to embody all the ancient virtues taught by Confucius; filial piety, propriety, justice, and benevolence. The duty of the sovereign, according to Confucian thinking, was exemplary living.

The character of the ruler—

Said Confucius—

is like wind, and the character of the common people is like grass, and the grass bends in the direction of the wind.

The scholar-official assumed dictatorial power, but this power was restrained by strict adherence to the virtuous pattern laid down by the philosophers.

Unfortunately, virtue departed and war lords came in as the old system was discredited as obsolete in an age of science and progressive education. Chinese youth did not realize that science was truth and also the old philosophy sought piety, justice, and benevolence, which are really handmaidens of truth. This group lived on, but without a soul. The termite-infested framework stayed on ready to be toppled by the Communists.

Chiang Kai-shek instituted some reforms, but let us not forget that his political philosophy was Confucian, as was that of his camp followers. He joined the Methodist Church and added ethical teachings found in the Bible to his Confucian list. The outgrowth was the New Life Movement, but China needed more than virtuous dictatorship. It needed complete reform. The possibility of reform was limited under Confucian philosophy as it would mean dismissal of one's loyal supporters, relatives, and friends. Obviously, under the Confucian system, the answer is, "No," for filial piety and loyalty to friends are cardinal virtues. Redemption was the only other recourse which Chiang was unable to effect, so retreat and retreat was the order of the day. Some dismissals came about as well as some redemption.

The Chinese Nationalists are now on the Island of Formosa where they are being aided. Our Government has been discouraged with them, but we have never given them up. We have partially fed them all along.

Now General MacArthur wants us to arm them for an attack on the Chinese mainland. In 1949, however, MacArthur did not have a very exalted opinion of Chiang's army. I was a member of a special delegation to the Far East in September of that year.

"I consider Chiang a highly intelligent leader," MacArthur told us, "but he knows nothing about the art of war. He is surrounded by corrupt officials and generals. His troops are very ineffective and poorly equipped."

Distrust of Chiang's forces was widespread in southeast Asia. Leaders there begged us not to send further equipment to the Chinese Nationalists, unless it was closely supervised. Newspaper stories out of Parkersburg, W. Va., in October 1949, quote me to the effect that the government of Chiang Kai-shek has wasted some \$2,100,000,000 in aid from this country. We learned the Chinese Nationalist officials actually have sold some jeeps given them on Guam even before they could be loaded on ships and sent to China.

At the time of our visit General MacArthur advocated the bombing of Chinese cities as a solution to the problems confronting us in Asia. He outlined four things that he considered necessary to save the situation:

First. Declare United States support for anyone opposed to communism.

Second. Place 500 planes in the hands of some "war horse" similar to General Chennault.

Third. Give volunteers the right to join such a fighting force without penalty.

Fourth. Assign surplus ships to the Chinese Navy sufficient to blockade and destroy China coastal cities.

The general estimated the cost of bombing the mainland at \$10,000,000,000. He said that the bombing would have to be followed up with occupation by American ground troops, at least enough for leadership purposes. Such an occupation, he said, would cost about forty billion.

MacArthur also told us that he did not expect an outbreak in Korea because the Chinese and Russian Communists had it outflanked and could have taken it any time they pleased. Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, MacArthur's intelligence chief in Tokyo, assured us that there would be no war in Korea for 2 years. The North Korean attack took place 9 months later.

Though MacArthur and Willoughby called the Chinese Reds "greatly overrated," and said we did not have to worry about them, American military leaders in Seoul held a very different opinion.

We spent 4 days in Seoul with Brig. Gen. W. L. Roberts, Chief of the United States Military Advisory Group to the Republic of Korea. I stayed in his home and had many opportunities to discuss these problems with him. General Roberts expressed grave concern over the situation there. He told us that elements of three North Korean divisions that had been fighting in China for 10 years had just arrived in North Korea.

Further interesting facts came to our attention when we were in Indochina. At the time we were there, the French had 175,000 troops fighting the Communists in Indochina, and the British had 50,000 fighting them in the jungles of Malaya. The French authorities told me that for 5 years prior to our visit, one-half of the graduating class of the French Military Academy had been casualties in the fighting against the Communists. These allies of ours have not shirked from the fighting. Many other countries have now joined them. For the first time in history we now have a truly international army fighting for peace and freedom.

I am deeply concerned over avoiding world war III, and I am positive that the stand of the United States and the United Nations forces in Korea has helped toward that end. I believe that the effort in Korea has kept Indochina, the gateway to southeast Asia's 8,000,000 people, from the Communists. To extend the war to the Chinese mainland would be costly and disastrous.

I have compiled some figures based on defense department records to show what that cost might well be in terms of soldier casualties. They show that the total Japanese casualties in China from the Japanese invasion of China until Pearl Harbor were 176,152. Their casualties, in China only, from Pearl Harbor until the end of World War II were 243,048.

So the total Japanese casualties in China were 419,200. These are only the casualties shown on partial records captured by our Armed Forces. During the entire time, the Japanese kept one and a half million of their best trained troops in China. The war held no conclusion for them, until they were finally driven out.

I have gained the impression from studying the question that Chiang wants his troops to invade the mainland only if he secures logistical support from the United States, as General MacArthur has recommended. He knows full well that if logistical support is provided the United States will be forced into an all-out war to regain China for Chiang.

I wish here to compliment General MacArthur on a good job in Japan. I have done my best here to give you the picture as I have seen it.

I maintain we should not go it alone, but should add our influence and power for a stronger United Nations for world peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I shall be glad to.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made a very valuable contribution by detailing the talks he had abroad with General MacArthur and others, and the gentleman commented that one of the statements made by General MacArthur was that we should furnish 500 planes.

Mr. BURNSIDE. The request was for 500.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; to be furnished to whom?

Mr. BURNSIDE. To the Chinese. He asked us first for bomber planes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was anything said about how those planes would be used?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Those planes would be used in bombing Chinese cities, the thought being that if you knocked out communication centers China would easily fall.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman was a member of what committee at the time General MacArthur made these statements?

Mr. BURNSIDE. The Executive Expenditures Committee.

Mr. KEATING. There were others present?

Mr. BURNSIDE. There were five—Walter Huber, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE], and myself.

Mr. KEATING. Did the gentleman and his committee render a report on its return?

Mr. BURNSIDE. We were very anxious for a report. I, personally, was most anxious to have a report. But I went to the floor leader, to the Speaker, to the national defense officials and I understand the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] went to the President, and it was thought this type of information at that time would be very danger-

ous to our international relations and I was asked personally not to give the statements out.

Mr. KEATING. Was any report filed at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes. Our committee filed a report, but this type of material was not in it because they thought it would be dangerous to our international relations.

Mr. KEATING. None of the material about which the gentleman is telling us today was incorporated in the official report filed at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I would not say none of it was incorporated, but the part that would endanger our international relations was left out.

Mr. KEATING. All of the information with reference to what General MacArthur stated to the gentleman and his committee was not contained in the report?

Mr. BURNSIDE. At that time we thought it would be very bad to put those statements in, since General MacArthur was Commander in Chief of the United Nations forces in the Far East.

Mr. KEATING. These additional statements with reference to his communications to the committee have just been brought to light recently?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes. I was asked not to release them.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman was asked by the committee?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, the committee did not want to release them. I had contacted others. I personally contacted the Speaker and the floor leader.

Mr. KEATING. At the time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. When we got back.

Mr. KEATING. And it was at their request that none of this information was given out?

Mr. BURNSIDE. We thought it would be dangerous to give it out, dangerous to our international relations.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Over what period was it that the Japanese lost 400,000 troops or had 400,000 casualties?

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is only a partial record. That is still not an accurate figure because these are the only ones we captured from the Japanese and the Japanese did not send back the whole picture.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That was in the Sino-Japanese War over a period of 10 years?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I broke it down into two parts. The first part was 176,452 and World War II was 243,048 that we know of.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is over a 10-year period anyway?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman makes the point that because of these tremendous losses in China the United Nations should not go into China?

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is a question to take into consideration and I thought the House would be interested in those figures. I had them compiled. Certainly with Japan very close by it would be much easier for that country, as far as

cost is concerned. That would be one reason why occupation costs would be high in China.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not favor invading China; but from the figures the gentleman has given us it appears we have had more casualties in the Korean conflict per year than there were in the Chinese-Japanese War?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Than we did?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Than the Japanese did.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I said that this is only partial. I tried to get the very best figures I could, that were available. I do not know how many there were and I doubt that the Japanese even know how many were lost.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The point I am making is this: We have had some 65,000 casualties in less than 1 year, but over a period of more than 10 years the Japanese only sustained 400,000.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I am not positive whether these were deaths or are casualties.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. What was the date of the gentleman's visit?

Mr. BURNSIDE. In August and September 1949.

Mr. KEATING. 1949?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes. We were not involved in any fighting at all.

Mr. KEATING. We were not in any war at all.

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. This was a statement by General MacArthur about what should be done in the future if we should get in a war.

Mr. BURNSIDE. He raised it as a possibility. No; he was advocating it as a possibility of starting a war.

Mr. KEATING. Of starting a war. In other words, he was advocating that our country begin a war; was he?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I guess, from the statement. Would you not say that is what it meant?

Mr. KEATING. When the gentleman returned from this trip, if one of our Far East commanders was advocating that we start a war, did not the gentleman feel that that was of importance to bring to the attention of the House?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Precisely. I did bring it, and evidently the Joint Chiefs of Staff then so acted that we did not start the war. Orders were so given that one was not started.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, upon the gentleman's return he reported the matter to someone and General MacArthur was called off on starting a war?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I do not know. I merely did what I thought was important and reported to the people that could take proper action.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman reported it to his committee, of course.

Mr. BURNSIDE. No, we did not take it up with the whole committee. That was not taken up with the whole committee. When a large number of people receive information it does not remain secret. That was taken up directly with the Speaker, and the floor leader, and

national defense, and the President of the United States.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman reported to the Speaker and the floor leader at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. At that time.

Mr. KEATING. That MacArthur was advocating starting a war in the Far East?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, that was a possibility. You can interpret it. These are the exact quotes. We took notes on that when we left and the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE, can substantiate those statements, too.

Mr. KEATING. But the gentleman made no official report nor did his committee in reference to any of these matters?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I think it is official if you report to the leaders in charge of this Government.

Mr. KEATING. I was referring to a report in writing to anyone.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, sometimes it is much better not to put things in writing when they directly affect our international relations in such an important question as the one we had at hand.

Mr. KEATING. Sometimes one puts important matters in writing, also.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, we have some in writing with the proper people, that is true, but we did not turn it back to the committee. A written statement was presented to the President.

Mr. KEATING. By the gentleman and his committee at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. No, not the whole committee. The individuals presented it.

Mr. KEATING. At that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. At that time.

Mr. KEATING. Did the gentleman participate in the communication which was sent to the President at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, certainly the ideas I have given here were taken over by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE, to the President.

Mr. KEATING. At that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. At that time. I called National Defense at that time. I spoke to the Speaker at that time. I spoke to the floor leader at that time.

Mr. KEATING. Did the gentleman and the gentleman from North Carolina and others or any others prepare any letter or other document which they presented to the President at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. The President has the written statement at that time.

Mr. KEATING. Signed by the gentleman?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Signed by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE, but I agreed to the statement.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman saw it before it was delivered to the President?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes; and this statement I have given here is also agreed to by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. If I am not mistaken, it was the President who told the world in the summer of 1950 that we had never been closer to world peace in 5 years. However, it was only a few weeks later that all hell broke out in Korea.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I cannot answer for that.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that veterans of World War II will soon be deprived of benefits under the GI bill unless the time is extended beyond July 25. Also that all GI benefits should likewise be extended to the Korean veterans.

Any veteran of World War II who desires to undertake a course of education or training under the so-called GI bill of rights must initiate such education or training within 4 years after his discharge, or within 4 years after the termination of war—July 25, 1951—whichever is the later date. This means that any veteran who was discharged before July 25, 1947, must initiate his education or training before July 25, 1951, or he will lose his rights to such education or training.

To my way of thinking this will work a great hardship on many veterans throughout the Nation unless the benefit period is extended. Veterans of World War II returned home from service with many problems. It is true that a great number have been able to take advantage of the educational training afforded under the GI bill. Others on account of sickness, financial difficulties, and such problems as taking care of their children and parents, were not able to follow the course of their neighbor and enter school at an early date. Such circumstances in many instances are changing.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair that we afford a reasonable opportunity for all veterans of World War II to take full advantage of the GI bill. Under an amendment that I introduced to the GI bill, an eligible veteran would be permitted to initiate a course of education or training within 4 years after his discharge or within 7 years after the termination of the war—July 25, 1951—whichever is the later date. Existing law provides that education or training under the GI bill of rights must be completed within 9 years after the war—July 25, 1956. My amendment would provide that such education or training must be completed by July 25, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, not only should the full benefits of the GI bill be extended for World War II veterans, but those same benefits should be extended to all the Korean veterans. It is true that the Eighty-second Congress recently enacted a law making medical, hospital, burial benefits and compensation or pension benefits available to persons serving in the Armed Forces on or after July 27, 1950—extending to such date as shall be later specified. This does not extend the World War II benefits such as vocational

rehabilitation, education, and training. Government guaranteed loans for housing and business, and readjustment allowances to the Korean veterans.

It is quite clear that persons on duty with the Armed Forces today are serving during a period of armed conflict and should be recognized as more than peacetime veterans. Many persons are being drafted into the Armed Forces from civilian life. They are having their education, training, or business activities interrupted, and are facing the hazards of the field of battle. To compensate for the physical hazards, the Congress recently enacted Public Law 28, but no benefits have been offered as compensation for the interruption of their education, training, or business activities. Certainly these veterans are entitled to the same consideration given the veterans of World War II.

To extend World War II veterans' benefits to the Korean veterans will require several adjustments in the time limitation factors. In order to allow ample time for veterans of Korea to become rehabilitated, and in order that they may take full advantage of these benefits, the limitations concerning application for benefits should be extended by at least 3 years and the period of time within which these benefits may be used should be extended by 3 years. Benefits of any nature will be worthless if their time limitations expire before the veteran is in a position to make use of them. The most equitable extension would be to extend to such date as shall be later specified by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, bills are now pending before the Veterans' Affairs Committee extending the benefits of the GI Bill of Rights to persons who serve on active duty during the period of present hostilities. Thus, persons so serving may become eligible for the same educational benefits, the same home, farm, and business loan benefits, the same assistance in seeking employment after release from active service, and the same readjustment allowances, as were made available for veterans of World War II. I sincerely hope that the House of Representatives will shortly extend the full benefits of the GI bill to the Korean veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think very likely the gentleman has introduced legislation to extend the time for World War II veterans for their education, and I have also introduced a bill which would give the Korean boys the benefits of GI training. Certainly the Korean boys ought to have it and they are pleading for that training.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts know whether or not her committee is planning hearings on this legislation within the near future?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not know. I know that I have asked for hearings, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to thank the gentleman for her contribution and I wish to state that I have likewise bills pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for that purpose.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATES of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a tribute to Kentucky by Daniel Francis Clancy.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. BREEN asked and given permission to extend his remarks and include certain statements from constituents of his district.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one include a speech by Brig. Gen. Donald P. Booth on May 19 at the Polish Soldiers Home of New York.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a soldier.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two speeches delivered at the proceedings of the Panama Canal Society's annual meeting honoring William Howard Taft.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the Governor of the State of New York.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. Ayres) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to include in his remarks on the India aid bill certain excerpts.

Mr. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Parsons (Kans.) Sun.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a proclamation by the city of Heraldsburg, Calif., and a newspaper item.

Mr. VAIL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include

a statement by Tom Moore, the great Irish poet.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Reader's Digest entitled "The Air-Power Odds Against Us."

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement from Labor.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. Priest) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKWORTH (at the request of Mr. Priest) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two addresses by Hon. CHARLES HALLECK, at Tulsa, Okla., May 11 and 12.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHARTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a speech delivered in the city of Pittsburgh by Mr. Robert W. Hansen.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a statement by the Zionist Council and an editorial on the Huleh Marshes appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala.; and

H. R. 3587. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 24, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

466. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Air Force certain property in the State of Mississippi," was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CLEMENTE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 385. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., with amendment (Rept. No. 492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to provide that the first Navy supercarrier shall be named the *James V. Forrestal*, with amendment (Rept. No. 494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3573. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settling of New Castle, Del., to be held in New Castle, Del., on June 16, 1951, with amendment (Rept. No. 495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, without amendment (Rept. No. 491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1834. A bill for the relief of Florence Grace Pond Whitehill; without amendment (Rept. No. 493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4229. A bill to provide that the antitrust laws shall not apply to organized professional sports enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4230. A bill to provide that the antitrust laws shall not apply to organized professional sports enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4231. A bill to provide that the antitrust laws shall not apply to organized professional sports enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4232. A bill to provide additional income tax relief for supporting blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4233. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans or cash payments in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FUGATE:

H. R. 4234. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4235. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4236. A bill to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as the North Laboto and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4237. A bill to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4238. A bill to repeal limitations contained in other laws on federally assisted low-rent housing projects authorized by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 4239. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to reestablish and correct the boundaries of the Quincy National Cemetery by the exchange of Government-owned lands in the Quincy-Graceland Cemetery, Quincy, Ill.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 4240. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, relating to the use of broadcasting facilities by candidates for public office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4241. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4242. A bill to amend section 801 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, in relation to exports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4243. A bill to preserve the primary military functions of the Barksdale Air Force Base bombing and gunnery range and to provide for payment to the city of Shreveport,

La., of proceeds from leasing of oil, gas, or other mineral deposits within said Air Force base bombing and gunnery range, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 4244. A bill for the relief of Herta Anna Maria Kottulinsky von Kottulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of former Capt. Charles W. Reid; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENISON:

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maude M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of Sigmund Spitz and Gertrude Spitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4250. A bill for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

297. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Arthur Raabe, secretary, Queensboro Federation of Mothers' Clubs, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging that legislation be passed to guard against the smuggling of narcotics into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in this quiet moment we would be conscious that Thou art nearer than breathing, nearer than hands or feet. Help us to put into the common round of daily life the awareness of Thy presence and the reality of eternal values. Forgive us that at times we are so dull of heart that burning bushes beside our path leave us unmoved and that in a world so full of Thy beauty we are so blind. In a day great with crisis and freighted with destiny for all the earth, save us from the unpardonable sin of making the hopes of the despairing world the pawns of partisan politics. In faith and confidence may we commit our ways unto Thee. Grant us a clearer vision of Thy way and Thy will and renewed courage to follow the gleam in this confusing hour. Amen.